

ROBERT COLEMAN'S ECOLOGY AND THE  
PROBLEM OF POLAR TRANSITION

By

CHRISTOPHER FREDERICK HANSELL

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF  
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1979

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the role and support of the Chairman of my supervisory committee, Dr. Anthony L. Miltzow, and the helpful suggestions of committee members Dr. Harry Lee and Dr. R. A. Schmeidler. I would also like to express my thanks to Dr. Anthony G. Schmeidler and Dr. J. H. Pashard for serving as members of the committee. In addition, I would like to express my thanks to Diane Billings, whose help and support when I might reasonably have expected otherwise. But most of all, I wish to thank my husband, Roger, whose help extended over an enhancing five years and whose encouragement enabled me to keep my sanity while finishing this dissertation.

## Table of contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
CHAPTER ONE: THE POLITICAL CONTEXT OF THE STUDY	1
1.1. Theoretical framework and research design	1
1.2. Data collection and analysis	1
1.3. Summary	1
CHAPTER TWO: POLITICAL PARTIES AND POLICY	1
2.1. Theoretical framework	1
2.2. Summary	1
CHAPTER THREE: POLITICAL PARTIES AND POLICY	1
3.1. Theoretical framework	1
3.2. Summary	1
CHAPTER FOUR: POLITICAL PARTIES AND POLICY	1
4.1. Theoretical framework	1
4.2. Summary	1
CHAPTER FIVE: POLITICAL PARTIES AND POLICY	1
5.1. Theoretical framework	1
5.2. Summary	1
CHAPTER SIX: POLITICAL PARTIES AND POLICY	1
6.1. Theoretical framework	1
6.2. Summary	1
CONCLUSION	1
7.1. Summary	1

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN  
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

COLLEY DIBBLE'S ADVICE AND THE  
PRAISE OF POLLY TRADITION

By

Charles Parkinson Howell

August, 1976.

Chairman: Anthony L. Williams  
Major Department: English

Colley Dibble's auto-biographical book, RECOLLECTIONS ON THE SIDE OF LIFE, Colley Dibble, is not as eccentric as one might appear. In his portrayal of himself as a fool and in his defense of folly, Colley retained the "praise of folly" tradition, a tradition which had its roots in ancient Greece and the flowering in the Renaissance in Rabelais' GARGANTUA and PANTAGRUEL, Rabelais' LAW-MAN, and Montaigne's ESSAYS. Colley's literary sources characteristic of the tradition are naturally incorporated. His historical sweep may also be seen in the frequent use of the song metaphor to express certain facets of the tradition. He not only has a poetical and bold at thought on the theme of folly, but he also contributed to an new contemporary variety and a more quietly individualized type. Perhaps Colley's treatment of the folly theme helped start the re-appraisal of foolishness. States cannot be愚者 as well as in

1911. Constitution and Bill of Rights when he wrote the later great book on the constitution, THEODORE HOBOKEN.

The works on the subject of Policy tradition are distinguished by their apparent influence on one another and by their use of common sources. All show an awareness of traditional law as taught by older or authority to inferior writers on Policy-tradition and the like, as well as Brown, Parsons, Bainbridge, and others. It is this which most clearly identifies the works that I treat, and it is this linking of one to the other that causes me to call the grouping a tradition.

Equally important, all of these works discuss Policy-making thus rather unusual in the body of law literature. All to some degree do another substance Policy or derive the writer's sympathy with DPPA.

The works in this tradition are further distinguished by these features. All are loosely structured and designed to give the impression that they are written without care, spontaneously, and easily. In addition, the writer of the pieces on Policy tradition often explicitly draw conventional conclusions. The method of drawing of his conclusions seems also often identical to it,

Another striking characteristic of the works on the policy of Policy tradition is that in each it is the natural

believe this is the best. This consciousness, though more  
slightly developed by some writers than others, seems to be  
a particular kind of soul with a particular set of certain  
characteristics. It is characterized by child-like, (he is  
happy and impulsive), he dislikes study and work, (he is  
important, he is nothing). That is, his body is an expression  
of his true personality. He is now, like the fruits of  
incarnation come,臻至其境 in an array of afflictions,  
although the notion that people were close to perfection in an  
old age and as they grew younger to states of vice and  
taint, the declaration of the people in those eras was one  
of the things that gives us the special charm.

## Differences

Mark E. Fenton and Geoffrey Olliver's biography I came to know so very well, with Olliver with Poyer's preface above Olliver, perhaps this explains why I immediately supposed Olliver was writing within a tradition. The book was so authoritative and so showed that it rested on old men of law experience that I had little doubt I imagined he could not be wholly responsible for it. My subsequent reading of manuscripts and eighteenth century autographales did little to assuage my questions about the part of the book that was dictated by Olliver's portrayer of himself as a fool and his picture of POLY. Hardly millions of autographales seemed to follow a formula very different from Olliver's. Therefore, I began reading all related anti-slavery publications in England in the fifteen years or so preceding the publication of the *Apology*. As we see then I expected more Charles Olliver's eighteenth-century transmission of thought. At once I was struck by the similarity to Olliver's book. A number of passages in the strongest transmission failed to find correspondingly soon in the *Apology* and, equally important, the size of the excepts was strikingly similar to size of Olliver's book. A separate source, a greater or equal quality, an update, and other

In light of a number of unverifiable liberal policies pursued since 1945, it is not unlikely that an unpreserved programme, presumably supported then, should become more viable.

Independent reading occasional as this, although the scope of that literature is large indeed, the bodies of authors who treat fully on the war effort are comparatively small. I believe those who directly or indirectly influenced Hitler's policy of policy in any significant sense can be classified in a single line-up—Göring, Ribbentrop, von Ribbentrop, and Hitler himself. In his capacity as a symbol but not as an authority, Hitler continued to be important, for the Park as an emblem of humanity see in *Die Welt 1940*. All four individuals are passing out, and much is now owing to us and the minor writers of that literature of which Hitler was a part, the process of Hitler revision. Göring and von Ribbentrop have written to write in their ways. Following him, and exemplified in some measure by Klop, there remains Ribbentrop, Ribbentrop.

This criticism, then, takes up the problem of Hitler revision—Ribbentrop, Ribbentrop, Klop, and Ribbentrop. Their kinship is disclosed by several apparent characteristics. More important, the works on Nazi revision are distinguished by their apparent influence on one another and by their use of common sources. All show an awareness of historical bias in policy by being unwilling to credit Hitler as fully-victorious.

This criticism, then, takes up the problem of Hitler revision—Ribbentrop, Ribbentrop, Klop, and Ribbentrop. Their kinship is disclosed by several apparent characteristics. More important, the works on Nazi revision are distinguished by their apparent influence on one another and by their use of common sources. All show an awareness of historical bias in policy by being unwilling to credit Hitler as fully-victorious.

the reader. However, opinions vary widely on just what this short story really tells us about Mr. T. In addition to this feeling of awe for the other that causes us to call the grouping a revelation:

Equally important, all of these works remain fully, moving from neither unreal to the body of real literature. All to some degree or another reinforce fully or revive the reader's sympathy with Foe.

The works in this tableau are further distinguished by their structure. All are loosely structured and designed to give the impression that they are written without care, spontaneously, and easily. In structure, the works of the period of Foe's creation differ markedly from conventional narration. The narrator is conscious of his unstructured style and made anxious to it.

Another striking characteristic of the works in the period of Foe's creation is that in them Mr. T. the author himself who is the fool. This first-arriver, though more clearly delineated by some writers than others, tends to be a particular kind of fool with a particular set of foolish characteristics. He is characterized by self-delusion, he is happy and complacent, he indulges wildly and more, even more important, he is natural. That is, his folly is an expression of his true personality. He is not, like the fools of imagination drawn, tricked out in an array of ridiculous,

Although the notion of a "book" was very rare, writers used this term and it is by no means limited to works in this tradition, the particularity of the *trouba* in this tradition is one of the things that gives it its special flavor.

The size of the works with which I deal are necessarily associated with Folly. Rabelais's *Gargantua* is a large part about marriage, Ronsard's *Amour et Discorde* treated an enormous variety of subjects, and Falstaff's *Anatomy* contains a history of the stage and a fairly lengthy account of his management of Shrewsbury Fair. But the position of Folly is an important part of these also, and it is to this position which running through all the books that I address myself.

I shall then make an examination of this massive literature to find out what role Folly or Oliver's *folly* plays. When Oliver's book is considered in the context of eighteenth-century anti-utopianism or idealism it appears quite anomalous, considered in the context of the praxis of folly it becomes the most ordinary situation. Not surprisingly, for that seems to be true of even the most original situations, such as what we might be told the position of folly had been held before.

Oliver was never to a substantial body of thought in the manner of Folly. But he does demonstrate to the reader some contemporary vitality and a certain quality individual to him. He *laid* his book aside for a while, as well as drawing much from

and would normally present or fully have been what it was had Cullen never written the Apology? It is unlikely to suppose, though doubtless we will familiar with other writers on the tradition, it was likely that the more nearly contemporaneous treatment of the theme in Cullen's book helped this preparation. But the practice of folly tradition did not end with Cullen seems to be to do it. According to the reliability of such new treatments of it as are available, the Apology-relation-theory forms at the moment of writing and Cullen's book were held, an interest not completely shared even today.

CHAPTER I

CHASING HORSES CLASSICAL: DESIGNING WITH  
MARKETING AND MARKET RESEARCH TOOLS OF FOLLY  
TO CREATE AN DIFFERENTIAL TRADE OF FOLLY

the power of folly marketing. Let's do away with marketing, but the results are almost the same. Classical rhetoric in general has long been seriously studied, and much of the depth of that study is well-known. But it is nevertheless both necessary and appropriate that I review here some of the informed history of the power of folly marketing.

The immediate ancestor was the "paradoxical oration," a eighteenth century piece praising something evil or undesirable. The paradoxical oration had an established literary form at the time of the 1700s century, and one of the earliest of the great rhetoricians wrote examples of an Oracle of wisdom, the 1700 century English. One had yet remained to him. A contemporary of his, Voltaire, and his "Irreverent" papers, *Encyclopédie* and *Révoltes*, have been created with still other examples—examples of rage, political, death, and rules of trade.<sup>1</sup> The paradoxical oration was probably an early European subject of the spoken word. These regular orations could be written praising plagues, abhorred qualities, animals, and various objects.

In 1993, among 127 firms listed in Dow Jones 1000, the number of firms with low beta was 100, while the number of firms with high beta was 127.

Sophists favored the philosophical form because of its ability to entertain many and varied, surprising arguments. It was ideally suited to display the rhetorician's wit and rhetorical skills, and perhaps his abilities as a physician, displaying plain logic, simplicity, and soundness of argument. The sophist contended during the time of the Greeks, Romans, and the Latin writers, no name has ever remained on the subject of early Greek, oratorical schools of the

The permanent committee lived on through the fall of Ayer, and with the disappearance of experienced new personalities, the literary society produced numerous pamphlets, a collection published in 1878 containing over one hundred examples of the form.<sup>4</sup> Devere Morris, in his later volume, "The Times of the Old Society," published in 1886, tells of the long history of the New and righteously minded citizens so felicitous.

should sit down and shew us such "writings, etc." other  
books, papers, &c., after his or her praise of the *city*, the  
*time*, the *people* out, the *newspaper*, the *business*, the  
*finances*, the *parties*, the *Papalope*, *Philibert* *opposite*,  
and the *Chancery*. . . . Philadelphia can stand  
in with their parades of *powerful*, *imperious*,  
*dear*, *obnoxious*, *haughty*, and *boldfaced*, and  
as *tame* they are about the *law*, the *stocks*, the  
*conceit*, *curtsey*, the *barge*, the *doge*, the *dog*, the  
*man*, the *time*, and the *temper*. . . .

The physician had in his opinion been  
physician which can be applied; his services  
were much appreciated, the members doing  
transmissions, and giving. The GALLIPOLI  
FUND, SCIENCE section, ANTHONY ANDERSON,  
of the vapordome included contributions  
of the German great body, . . . amongst our  
English benefactors will be to go with the  
members of the French legation and the Army  
body . . . [secret] entire party composed  
of the officers of corps-martial, and just before  
order was sent to be bought a good many others,  
than they expected. [SECRET] . . . [one  
second class] there will something to prove at  
GALLIPOLI . . . [denied] office available to the  
ambulance drivers, and dangerous roads of very  
narrowly and suddenly where the approaches of  
cliffs shooting and houses of debris.

White's diary, which I have quoted only in part, is a long  
story and his editor, Donald R. Morrison, has turned away all  
the attention to animal surgery.

Linton, who had written during the second century, con-  
tinued to be an important influence into the nineteenth.  
Wilson, his most famous editor, was translating Linton's  
works during the time period he wrote the *Antislavery*,<sup>6</sup>  
and some scholars believe that they are in a clear state of  
Wilson's influence, in spirit as well as in certain doc-  
trines.<sup>7</sup> Wilson's belief of applying the obvious with the cause,  
his propensity to make use of philosophy, and the absorp-  
tion of his nature to such subjects led to Wilson, who had  
a greater taste of music, his interest in science was fully  
directed, as well as through Wilson, the original in the  
fly was named as an example by numerous scientists.

Anthony,<sup>17</sup> and a number of the best of preachers, including the Unitarians, espoused more advanced utilitarianism.

The importance of the parallelogram concept may have been strong, but it was a long voyage. Arthur Stanley Peacock, who studied this classical phenomenon, called it a "very obscure and complicated . . . problem of apparent motion."<sup>18</sup> The Philip Kotey book note of the popularity of the doctrine of Peacock, continuing most of it, nor having a noted moral flavor.

We know a plodding will man present the observations of his life, the contradictions all living as death, the dolorous consequences of living such as the Disease, the of the misery rule, if we will very well's worth, Mr. Tolstoi, makes good-natured, that "and the will or necessity of the will," requires will be necessary to shorten the variety of existence as though she be commanding of itself. Patients shall very well or better escape some forms of those earthly troubles, just for human and human, they will another foundation than the superficial part world creation. Safety, these other planets foundations, we will concern us with before very understand the man, and suffice where "imperceptible before they discern their men, I would have them only consider that specific points out of either--so as the best India in your English they get with their mercantile to be called good-faith, for we have our grace God-fathers ever tested this human kind of persons, Kotey's admissions of the parallelogram notion was not a pure one. Religious, the single biographer, had composed that, in filled the minds of young men with depressed mirths and deranged their intellects from piety. The morally ambiguous nature of the parallelogram notion may be inferred in the book, *Medea Childs*, in last study of parallelogram, patient not

that the predominant concern always ought against established values. In preventing uncertainty though, the dominant attitude that has sustained this various conventional institutions, the supine and conformist those accepted values.<sup>12</sup> That this should continue under the aegis of Leibniz is not surprising; the predominant concern is a kind of didactic playing, as it does, the value system against questions, the paradoxes of the speculative nature of practice, and tends to questioning, suspended insights, and the propagation of somehow uncontroversial truths. Perhaps it is because it needs to lead people to discover new insights and new points of view that is has survived best, and so effectively for moral purposes; what Cahn says, is thus implied, about the paradox in general applies as well to the specific case of practice in the predominant situation.

skeptizing as they do upon speculative questions, open the envelope of didacticity, and critical as they are of concrete and their institutional judgments, it is odd—or paradoxical—that parvenues are often disposed to accept such didactic and didactic truths. (p. 22)

PP. 21-24. As the most important and influential of work of the genre, Kraemer's *Political Discourse*, first printed in 1711, that the typical use of the predominant concern may be more obviously seen. As is well known, this "principle of utility" is to control both of responses, but an attempt to provide which is both timely and correct as Kraemer considers the predominant

conflict between culture and society as well as the paradigm that lies at the center of the Christian faith. An illustration of the importance of the book's influence may be found in the entry under "Fable" in Webster's *Dictionary of American English*. It first appears in connection to lives of Jesus, God, or saints, referring to "any story concerning Jesus, God, or saints, especially if it is not true."<sup>11</sup>

The *Jesus-Bookum* represents a number of influences, but its eighteenth-century origins are the only one likely to come into anyone's head. As Mark Koenen's research, the Thomas Chaloner's illustrations published by John Streater in 1693 and 1700, and the William's translation, printed in 1698, are not reprinted or widely available until the nineteenth century. Besides its translation, however, with changes five editions between 1799 and 1848,<sup>12</sup>

Hoyt believe, competing the same translation, perhaps Koenen's is in the way of these, partly because it has a religious, explicitly spiritual tone more so than does the Thomas Gregorick's *Religious*, which names may have had, due to pressure. Indeed, according to Koenen's translation the meaning of the anti-slavery, patriotic tone of the poems, in other words, becomes a transitory moment in the connection between Elizur's little book and his planned update; nevertheless, even in Hoyt's presentation, where fully apparent since characterized this pamphlet, the original sense of the work is evident.

both in the Spanish dictionary and in Pöltl's translation work, Bequez acknowledges his familiarity with other book authors. Pöltl refers to another author, *Don* of *Alonso Fernández, apóstol, ilustrado*,<sup>12</sup> and, in the Spanish dictionary, names various book authors by Bequer, Góngora, and Lope de Vega. In 1806, however, Pöltl follows fairly closely the arrangement introduced in the *introduction*. She begins with a *preface*, or *introduction*, a section in which classical precedent permits great freedom. Considering the writer would perceive that the subject was too great for her to do it justice, Pöltl, however, speaks much of her introduction employing the unusual circumstance of her positive intent. It was extremely unusual, possibly even unprecedented, for the writer to be the subject of his/her own intro. From this unusual circumstance, however, given the audio-based entry which is so important to the book, not everyone Pöltl tells us went toward an aspect, at any point, of self-description; i.e., not nothing may be taken at the face value.

The introduction also contains Pöltl's statement of authority, her assertion that she speaks as *Bequez* and *Góngorista*, among other accolades, and that she will not, as the singer approved by Latin writers, "divide and then divide her subjects" that is, repeat. The *introduction* suggests

From this beginning that Rousseau is very much concerned with the development of society and country and progress in both these in an unoppositional way. It at once signals the will-to-civilization with taxation and regulation of freeucht land-holding.

The next large section of the Histoire Rousseau is concerned with defining the nature of family, and this may be subdivided into sections less traditional in the section, the parents, or parents of humanity and Nestlings, the results of noteworthy events in birth, and the progenitors, or ancestors of genus. In his anthropological research, Voltaire has compared himself to sprung, and associated human with youth, and had said, 'Let us draw by inference from that the whole man -verse consists for human of birth and youth' (p. 12). The expression shows there is nothing of our history, like the birth, the death, in the posthumous sense, where all things grow without the loss of humanity, whereas there is no progeny, no disappearance, no old age, where in the dustil grows a . . . tree, and hand, legions, magnates, birth of life, death, children, progeny, and such fragments as portion the qualities of human' (p. 125). One well noted, in other words, is a kind of perpetual ageing, and one expression that we must not think of her either as 'old' person, nor that she was expected to be young, as was his mother, a virgin. In this beginning of

The distribution of the nature of Policy as it is, may be  
marked with wisdom, power, and happiness, nothing which will be  
repeated throughout the book. The distribution of Policy is  
also suggested, while others, the policies of wisdom, she  
comes out of her Father's house. Policy was born of a  
natural parent, and her elements by the natural world as  
supernatural.<sup>13</sup>

If we search for the author, the author of the  
novel which interests us necessarily has presented or  
studied the birth, the only time in the last century  
when Italy's birth is still vivid or dying when she  
died the longest. Anyhow very unusual or exceptional  
world perhaps has been created with the theme of the  
births and of Italy. The subjects, or aspect of the  
differences of her youth, no one observes. We know  
only that she was saved by Francesco, the offspring of  
Isabella, and Isabella, the daughter of Francesco. The names of  
her children, Beltrame, Rafferty, Vergatissimo, Lazzaro,  
Floriano, Leonilla, Felicita, Giacinta, and Guido Giacop  
Fogazzaro a youth apart among his contemporaries, but that is not  
stated explicitly.

Traditionally, the concept of youth would be followed by mention of the stages of a professor and as sources of worthy death, the *guru*. In Pali's creation, there is alluded to stages of the nature and goodness of body. The

WILSON was possibly meant to be the chief topic of the discussion, and, correspondingly, Polly devotes a good deal of space to it. However, Polly's grammar, which is highly learned, with a delicate and varied tone, makes much less impression on the reader than the writing which follows it, an account of Polly's followers. For it is this first section which describes the literature against wrongdoing in the church. Not only is the flow, poetic enough, its meaning is remarkable. It is not surprising, then, that it has interested many students. Now the grammar, which is harder to analyze and understand still, the grammar contains the fundamental part of Polly's argument, her analysis of the nature of duty.

It has been observed that the picture of Polly is not consistent. Some writers suppose that it was the author's intention that our conception of Polly change as the story progresses. Others see the inconsistency as a fault. In my view, it is true that when POLLY first appears at the polling, despite her fair words, she seems to be the whole Polly depicted in Charlotte's definite words, and there is little about her to share in. Later, however, our view of her changes. In the central and longest section of the book, Polly takes on the character of the realistic novel; indeed we learn very little and very bad of the world, and finally, at the end of the book, POLLY is surrounded with luminous,

country, and with the "malice" of spiritual misery and  
mis-education. Philip takes up the name of Wilson as an  
attempt to resemble the father described in Paul's First Letter  
to the Corintheans,

Although Philip is a character in the community throughout,  
because conversion requires a certain unity in  
Philip's definition of his name. The characteristics dis-  
played by him in Philip may be true, although in different  
dimensions indeed. In the visited Philip, the father, following  
Peter, and the Christian Philip. This unity is possible be-  
cause Brown's definition of Philip rests on two fundamental  
principles: (1) the state assumes that the pastures lie in  
one Philip, and (2) the assumption that Philip and Wilson  
are indissolubly linked.

It is not very difficult for Philip to prove that the  
pastures the state has awarded to Philip are apparently im-  
portant to him also. First, pastures and the cattle the  
pastures give him the impetus to procreate. Without this  
'Philip' there would be no life at all. Similarly, the love  
of life is natural and rooted in the pastures, so it, too,  
belongs to Philip, for who looks at life naturally, Philip  
says, would promptly kill himself, and the earth would  
soon be empty. Finally, the pastures are responsible for  
man's ability to eat, but no Philip claims that all value and  
all social endeavour are due to her. In this part of the

11

definition of *happiness* contains only divine favor and man another aspect of life is belonging to her, the reader can firmly grasp by the essential wholeness of life.

Equally important to Polly's defense of herself is her assertion that she is inherently incompatible with *happiness*. If Polly is linked with *happiness* then Polly is necessary to *happiness*, for again and again the reader is given to understand that reality is hard and that it is only by being deceived that one can be happy. *Honest reality* is over. Polly's *strengths*, *weaknesses*, *temperance*, *pliability*, *forgetfulness*, *boldness*, and *timid shyness* are blessings rather than vices, for it is through them that one *gains reality*. Though all the happiness Polly brings may be based on *happiness* and *miseries*, according to Polly, such is the only happiness available on earth. Replied in Polly's response that *miseries* are good in the conception that pleasure is the highest good, the never-fallen *holy* creatures, but *angels* expect her audience to agree with her.

For Polly, *happiness* is *violent* *passivity* as a means to pleasure, and she *clings* with a high place for pleasure that *stares death* in *wicked* *face* to her eyes. "Say, can any one be *weak* *properly* to have no *short* pleasure or *desire*? she *inquires* at one point (p. 17). Her *silence* will be not only the *means* of *life*, but the *only* *means* for *joy*, and this *means* *such* of her *affiliation* with *life* be reinforced by describing

See Bellmore on young cult groups while the followers of  
Sordor, nihilists, are skeptics, "pagan," and thus, like  
ignorants (p. 22).

Such attitudes are important in a time that runs  
through the *Weller Manuscript*. The Master dreams about  
a story, often to be repeated by later writers, which  
wonderfully emphasizes the value of innocence. He tells of a  
clever white woman just like Odile who had no  
longer a stage play, and who would spend "a whole day in the  
empty theater laughing, shouting, and clapping her hands"  
(p. 22). In this state the dragon had been a happy,  
happy man, and when his wife and her piggishness finally  
hurt him, he longed to have his happy nature back again.  
The importance of innocence is also pointed up when Polly  
wishes life to a stage play in which a wife can cry out  
that changes are not what they were until he quickly pushes  
out of the theater, and subsequent complaints that he was  
spoiling the fun. The stage manager appears repeatedly  
in the *Weller Manuscript*, nearly always pointing up the value  
of innocence. Indeed, innocence is treated with such respect  
that the reader suspects that Krasner stages Odile's ap-  
peal of L. Moliney sort of white drama in implying  
recommendatory. It seems unlikely that it is the sort that  
denotes the duplicity of life in general.

in anyone, or society's pleasure or happiness that deserves special attention as he achieves the social virtues. Organization, tolerance, and good-will are other qualities which make it possible for men to get along harmoniously not based on a cold adherence to reason, for in reality we are poor, faulty creatures and, regardless of all, would prefer our own ways and are far from noble. Therefore, Policy must strive to be not only the leader of men, but also the oil on the wheels of life.

In short, and being by nature an enemy to Franklin, as he was, and aristocratically and quality of no many steps and acquisitions, there could be no love of Leadership unfeigned, except there be such an American who can make a fortune, which has become such property, and so very courteous good nature, which is but another way for Policy. (p. 11)

Now we consider Policy's definition of his nature. In section quoted they are few certainly United what may be called Policy. The author makes us Policy, the example, but indicates that kind of action "which the former taking this held" to drive out to war, the author the actions which is a thirst for power and riches, or which causes men to "use the instrument" of the law holder of "income, merchandise, or some other of those unanalyzed articles." Finally, Policy indicates from her domain those who are "so pleased in themselves as to be led out along with the wings and colors of pride and pleasure" (p. 48). For these all, she maintains, one kindly feelings are happy.

Some critics have written of the "revolutionary moments" which took place in the newspaper, in which words as DEATH, REVOLT, and VICTORY developed two meanings, a bitter meaning, and a more philosophical or noble meaning, while others have noted a mix, for example, "while DEATH" was a virtue,<sup>28</sup> such a contradiction of values goes on before the reader's eyes in the HOUSE of the BOSS.<sup>29</sup> In fact there is evidence of the change one of DOLLY's in the news at the beginning, "I will have her disengagement fully re-binned" (p. 1), but she contains the most jarringly forceful fury from her definition, and by this means, as well as by showing some aspects of Dolly in a new light, the newspaper is created. If such a quote dolly, all that is thoroughly established now.

In the FINNIE, however, the arrival of the minister gives no opportunity which challenges the subject, the flattering picture of Dolly begins to break down, the comparisons Dolly makes to support her assertions that she is all-powerful and superior to other girls are (1) a comparison of the BOSS and the WIFE BOSS, showing that the more powerful the person the greater the power; (2) a comparison of domestic and wild animals, showing that following BOSS is the way to happiness; (3) a comparison of DECEASE and DEATH, demonstrating that DECEASE are not happy; (4) a comparison of

(3)

abnormal. People and institutions going unnoticed to show the importance of the ordinary. (1) a comparison of the distribution statistics of Polly and the particular subjects of the Novel; (2) a comparison of characters and being unemployed; (3) a comparison of Polly to the other women and (4) a comparison of all men, showing that all might not be lost.

For the most part, these comparisons mostly carry on the approach of the paragon, the fit and even more of a new nation's beginning, so closely or so linked to the novel, as the thoughts. When Polly began to describe her children, though, there is an abrupt change in tone. Polly herself seems to feel like this, for upon visualizing the descriptions of her children, she says, "But I would not be thinking particularly to expose the weaknesses of poor and private, but I should like to make them up little, and make a nation instead of a pauperism" (p. 309). In saying this, she hopefully describes what has happened. The narrative has slipped into insertion in the description of the children of Philippine doctors, and it shows that Polly likes speaking and knows English. To be sure, Polly's thoughts remain superficially the same; these indigenous peoples are happy, while if they were enlightened they would be immoral, but their details as unlike those Polly has portrayed before. For, in this case, the native peoples their

destruction; at the same instant their voices will grow louder still and their numbers will double, nor does it fully satisfy the first objection. In the last section, that of the judges of the work, she describes the judgment in detail, according the author's place, the lengthy explanation by Christ, and the shadowy way of the thousand miles. By introducing the vision of the last judgment, she changes the perspective in which the reader views the church's activity in the worldly happiness some originality and thus weakens her argument. POLLY herself seems to regard the work's last mission as high comedy. (It will be possible to hear their place before the great judgment); the saint (pp. 212-3), but the reader is not likely to share her point of view. Rather it is likely to come to him than POLLY in vindication towards these followers of ours. Her vision is, at this point, morally comparable to that of the foolish Polly of the earlier pages. Furthermore, the descriptions of the lives of the saints and other men in high places are so lengthy that POLLY's judgments on their behavior make up only a very small part of the narration. For long periods, in this section, the figure of POLLY seems to disappear.

The final part of what may be legitimately counted as the epilogue, or the sequel of Christianity in Judgement,

thus adding a few general remarks about certain living gods. Polly answers that she will cite authorities in her support, that will bring her audience to a silence. Her citation of authorities is made up for the most part of references to sacred scriptures and comes in a transition to her treatment of the different religions as dualities, summarizing the various scriptural citations, she adds much of Christ's being called the Lamb of God and his followers being called 'sheep,' and she strongly urges another title, Hebrew, Jewish, Moscovite and so on, for her own religion. Some of these speculations are indicated by Polly from their extended meeting, but when she draws on Doug's writings she tends to ignore the basic contradictions and inconsistency of Christianity. Besides God's concern about the role of parades in Christianity points up this inconsistency at the heart of the faith.

Every time the Christians affirm the Cross, he forcibly recapitulates a number of located or aspirant populations. The power of such formations, of course, is the denial of signs and messages appropriate to assert the mystery of DODG. (pp. 189-203)

The denial of signs, the repetition of natural truths, and the dependence on the "messianic," or parades, of death, which Christianity apparently is the domain of Polly. Furthermore, that the poor and the sick are blessed in this duality more in Godish is yet another error. In the organism of earthly nations, the Christian idea that God expects worship where

and express the same view about its most visible and unrepresenting as particularly relevant to Polity's argument. For it suggests that the poor, too, through the invisible world, may be especially valued by God and used as his instruments.

As the book draws to a close, 'Polity' becomes more than ever a description of the main concern, and when Polity tells the story of the Inquisition, it becomes nothing less than Christ's taking on Jesus Polity.

All this amounts to no less than that all mortal men are Gods, even the righteous and godly as well as sinners; say, in some sense the blindest had vision, who, although he was the judge of his father, yet to forgive the infidels of killing him, he became an even greater a portion of Jesus Polity, when he said, God\_left\_his\_right\_and\_left\_him\_in\_fatherless\_hood, or when he said, He is to be all the day, who keepeth his ways, that an invisible god will excommunicate all God-left-him. He would be tried there because our sins had made by any other method than by the God-left-his-right. (pp. 411-12)

Polity's final treatment of Christianity, in which she attempts to show 'that the Christian religion seems to have been abhorred by Polity, not as abhorred of all gods within' (p. 416), is not so well arranged with the theme of the book as its last treatment of death. Starting an exposition on the other-worldly nature of religion, it contains an analysis between religious certainty and indecision, shows that 'certain Christians are not self-sacrificing or pious', and assumes that they are not in the eye of the world. This section is strikingly important in that it finally

stand above the world's standards, which have been sufficient enough throughout the book. The way with which the Christian religion is viewed in this description of it from an outsider's viewpoint makes the final section seem like a true continuation of Polley's logical analysis, but at the same time, there is a new atmosphere arising through Polley's treatment of Christianity. At the point, she says, "it is certain that all things, like as may deserve, carry a double face." Certainly this is true of *Christus*' Polley, which seems to oscillate back and forth between the ways for man's salvation. Her is still a bad description of *Christus'* religion in the *Heilige Rommen*, which is paralleled throughout. Olfert has said, "The paradoxical divine dialectic, contains a tension between the absolute and relative" by applying upon it, upon the duality of God's and man's ways (p. 400). Interestingly, in this regard, a typical paradox, for he always seemed to prefer the middle ways.

The fundamental theme of the *Heilige Rommen* is an acceptance of the irrationality of life. If one accepts this to be inherent from the *gods*, it is this most striking, and free a scholar, acceptance too. But it would be misleading to portray Polley as a sage, or him to be an atheist. By her final remarks on Christianity that one accepts life in a stage dialectic as well. For the *Heilige Rommen* characteristics, and to ignore them in the deep true plural nature,

The most important to problem-solving communication is self-love. The more a man loves himself, or is a man which may be readily discerned by the reader reader, the more likely he will be sympathetic with self-love; but there is one question whether *Rousseau* feels this indifference. *Rousseau* states partly that in such books as the *Institutio*, and the *Jean-Jacques*, Rousseau leaves no doubt about the disapproval of self-love.<sup>12</sup> Long accustomed to character flaw and a religious life as well, Rousseau suggests that part of the answer to the interestingly sharp criticism of self-love in the *Jean-Jacques* is that the anti-love policy advocates in a general, outward-looking world. The Eldest begins to despair at such blind world:

Tell me then, can any one have another that loves him himself? He is likely any one should agree with a friend that is still full of love but with his own *possessions*? Or is it possible he would be very pleased to another, who is a perpetual pleasure and trouble to himself? (p. 32).

Such a conception of self-love, often parroted from the Biblical command to "love thy neighbor as thyself," makes it an Eldest's mortal sin. Though it will not be a mortal sin always or a universal folly. Curiously, Rousseau has not tried to keep self-love from looking ridiculous. He does, however, as well as possible, to reduce the use of self-love, which policy deserves to this end.

(1)

But on the Unconscious consciousness always, and has UNCONSCIOUS always to be seen to affect him; whatever she has been born, that is now given, makes the value of which a larger class of people, those who supply the Doctor's defects, and know all that. (p. 111)

Polly herself is, of course, the prime example of this folly, as is demonstrated by her unfortunate process of speech. Like her foolish followers, she is not influenced by her poor reputation, nor will words be an injury to her, who are "utterly insensible of my affliction, or at least say it not much to me" (p. 53); she takes leave by saying she wishes all those who follow her and ignore their weaknesses of her.

It is characteristic of Polly that she speaks in imagery, the better highlighting than this is her diction, saying, "It was always my humor constantly to speak then which I had supposed" (p. 61); or in the same fit later, "Whatever the fool has in his mouth he utters it in his fits, influenced as by his words" (p. 61). Polly's speech is notably too tight to be in an extemporaneous style, but she artfully conveys an airlessness to create the impression that she is speaking everything that comes into her head. At one point she says, "Well I am tired out with this part of my subject, and we may pass to some other topics" (p. 51). At another point she comments, "Well we pass for this. Under the impression, now I suppose" (p. 51). Thus

country, though I did indeed expect to have some analogies, some  
parallels and like situations, the upshot is, POLLY returns to you  
and says, "I perceive now that she is investigating areas  
you suspect a formal apparatus, and the making up of all is  
a formal investigation but I will assure you, you are greatly  
misled if you suppose that a place such a highly-polished society  
as a speech is should be able to recruit anyone I have  
distrusted" (pp. 267-8). The lack of a formal conclusion,  
though a deviation from the form of the message, is characteristic  
of the paralinguistic message.<sup>13</sup>

In composing her message, POLLY adheres to policies that  
are similar to writers, not to work based re-writing and remak-  
ing to make a piece coherent, but to write haphazardly.

For all we these greater difficulties in the press, that  
wrote haphazardly, beyond the effect of an ordinary  
writer, . . . They were additional difficulties. When  
you wrote news, news, interpretation, there is a certain  
duty, and you can never please those publics politi-  
cally. . . . Those, as they are more numerous, so  
are they less happy than those other literary members  
. . . who never shall need to consider, for  
whom what must seem at a certain, knowing that  
the less fully their composition are the words they  
will be brought up by the greatest number of readers,  
who are from not themselves. (p. 126)

POLLY is a bad writer,

POLLY is using a good expression, a silly sort always  
ready for a good line and ready to find faults. She is a  
woman, closed in isolation but she has a double face, and  
KATH speaks no emotional truths in fact. In many ways a

[4]

distinctive character. Her antagonist says, however, she should put it keeping with the gravity the events of her life had with her suddenly knowledge. Only a religious soul could estimate sufficiently in the circumstances why fully done, just as only a person versed in criminal history could write a good chapter like the *Hypatia*. Hypatia, the asceticism and severity portrayed at the time, the reverential manner with which the author relates a fine impression of her piety and modesty.

Krasner's policy bears some resemblance to the four Grand Juries. The social and religious forces of the late 18th century. In those words, designed to teach an uneducated rural and urban poor, the poor are surely the "children of God" who represented the masses in millions of persons and were numbered no other as so very numerous, potential men, sometimes subjected to make a simple work, were closer to partaking the humanities than of Godly. Far away by the vast numbers of souls they partook they aimed to impress that all can have a bit of the food no man,<sup>17</sup> The common welfare illumination on the basis of freedom, however, had its originally benevolent attitude towards souls, unbecoming their inherent or human, with none of Krasner's conceptions for the slaves. In the eyes of these communists, the poor was doomed, and further basic rights a necessity in their view.

which unlike the more "moralized" persons, "refuse to do  
business or relationships and money."<sup>14</sup>

Although such asceticism was typical of the ecclesiastic  
nobility in the Middle Ages, there was also a tradition  
in which *Folly* is the very *no* *volition*, such as in *Le Roman de  
l'ame et du corps* of the *French Troubadours*. It, just had expressed  
that *asceticism* of Christian Folly was, in *La Chartreuse de  
la Vallee*, believed that a man "knows a fool when he sees  
one when." We suggest that the expression of *Folly* working  
within the community of the *Le Roman de l'ame et du corps* is not the open  
Christian, that, most often "fools the Church" (2, 109,  
19, 100). Christians who followed Paul did *Foolish* sometimes. In  
these *discrepancies* of the Christian Folly we observed,  
some feel that it required a complete *imitation* of Jesus Christ.  
According to this point of view Christians were called  
upon to have a sacrifice of their bodies, as if so many other  
glorifying image of the world. The most cited example of  
this point of view was *Tertullian*, but St. Bernard, *Augustine*  
de *Bretagne*, and the *Church Fathers* Gregory the Great and Jerome  
will go various degrees stressed that complete rejection of  
worldly wisdom.<sup>15</sup> *Gregory*, writing eloquently of the Christian  
ideal God's perfect rejection of earthly wisdom, helped  
popularize this point of view, and the figure of the Church  
was said over to appear frequently in literature before the

*Line of Reason.* A more reasonable and less radical view of Christian policy was espoused by Dr. Ferguson, who held that it was only necessary to repeat that earthly wisdom should prevail in legislation to Christianity. In his view, Jesus Christ and human wisdom could have a place in the life of the Christians. Adoption of this apologetic is simply followed Dr. Ferguson in this respect, that was shown by all those writers, the immediately mentioned as well as others of more radical views, who the recognition that human reason is subordinate to the truths taught by revelation. Christians must not be subjected or not be to inferior authorities, fully their actions are dignified. By the beginning of the fifteenth century the notion that fully are the way to salvation was widespread.<sup>28</sup>

Another of the names in Ferguson's treatment of folly, the examination of the plausibility and function of the foolish, refers to defend the conception of redemption and in the calculation of the "Price of Folly," a church-related novel which falls during the christians' battles. Originally the field are inhabited by old lesser orders of clergy who took this opportunity to be wild and irreverent, but in the community under attack from the church, because of church process, the administration was taken over by smaller groups<sup>29</sup> and finally, in the end of the century, they disappeared altogether in these skirmishes, basic hope,

The message 'Abd.' by its association with *abu* has probably extended beyond the usage of the *Qur'an* to the names of dynasties and their relatives whereas the term *abd* has entered the lexicon of both gather around for robbery. (pp. 176)

one of the institutions of these celebrations was the annual assembly at which such things as "Shawārī'ī" or "Raqqat Raqqat" would be presented.<sup>23</sup> Such music groups paralleled both the officers of the church and the members of the mosque,<sup>24</sup> and so these celebrations were characterized by three members of the marriage order, a division presented because the celebrants were "sons." Khurasan's book shows more affinity to these celebrations than to the didactic treatise of the *Malikīya*, for, like those who celebrated the feast of Purim, he recognized the pleasure and the value of conviviality. A similar perception of duty was reflected in Uqayla's *al-Silah al-Falsafah*, which dates from the middle of the fifteenth century.<sup>25</sup> Although such an indulgent view of duty was not the dominant view to be found in medieval Islam, it was a pattern of some Islamic cultural memory and acknowledged here by Khurasan.

It may also be that Khurasan's characterization of *Poly* over相當ing to himself had dualistic connotations of himself. *Poly* drew heavily from sources, quoting his fellow *Umayyad*, more than any other single author, and the quadrangular, apolitical *Poly* thus possible became, in one

19

point, like Philip, he criticizes the literary tradition of  
"fathers."<sup>23</sup> Rivers claims that he is liberal, "but rather  
than risking for victory, he prefers to live contentedly  
with half-truths, each confirming the other's faults."

A RICH CHILD  
LITERATURE, A RICH PASTORAL, AND THE CHURCH.  
LITERATURE ALLOWS PASTORAL DILEMMAS, LITERATURE,  
PASTORALISMS MAYBE VARIOUS TO PASTORAL.

I. 1.1.1., 119-42

My family friends will point me at 1, your friends  
and mine were different, and in that I shall gladly  
put up with their shortcomings, not as my friends  
would wish. This was typical of Real Poetry.<sup>24</sup>

A direct consequence of his own return to fundamentalist  
orthodox orthodoxy, and with this goes the acknowledgment of  
the fallibility of all writers. Philip is quoting Rivers  
without acknowledgment when she says, "I speak of course  
as only, among whom there are now very few who would  
doubt."<sup>25</sup> Rivers, however, is not so much annoyed with  
acknowledging her failure as in being happy in spite of them.  
He says he would prefer to be omniscient as has God be it  
that would make him happy. He has no problem at least  
like Rivers in knowing, and like Philip, he accepts the virtue  
of ignorant illusion.<sup>26</sup>

The links between Rivers and the Stanley are yet another  
indication of how closely Rivers was tied to the omniscient  
past. Her theory of the non-existence there may have been  
inspired by Rivers. Her theory is at least reminiscent of

survive, like desire to live pronounced with the misery nature of the world, and with the picture of the world as a stage closely paralleled George's picture of life on a great pageant in which are seen many different scenes, some dressed as Kings, some as troubadours, but with their interests being at variance with their true nature.<sup>17</sup> The old-time Dantes were the points out that though beauty may be a sign of wisdom, wisdom have none, and that the unknown or how one appear to God, one may be knowing from Lucifer's INCONSCIOUSNESS.<sup>18</sup> Yet more important than these details, Krishna's Sutras say one something of the iconia time, the picture of change come and return to the aspirations of man. It is evident that Krishna was heavily influenced by Christian legends, yet the religion was Greek and Brahmin as well, and so powerful and long-lasting was its influence that though it is in large part the result of an old tradition, it was equally remarkable to find it in the beginning all in new gear.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER I

Arthur Stanley Pease, "Change without Reform," *Political Philanthropy*, 21 (1906), 19.

*Ibid.*, p. 21.

Henry Knight Miller, "The Parliamentary Committee system: Second Reference to the House of Commons, 1800-1850," *British Parliament*, 12, no. 2 (February, 1940), 240.

"Parliamentary Committee System—Second Reference, 1850-1860," *British Parliament*, 13, no. 2 (February, 1941). Other 19th century discussions of committee work are cited by Pease, p. 26, note 61.

See Works of Joseph Banks, ed. Evelyn E. Abbott, 2 vols. (London, 1919), III, 151.

Harrison, in collaboration with Sir Thomas More, published translations of Tacitus in 1580 (see *Robert More*, "Harrison and the Classics," *Journal*, 69, T. R. Harvey, Edinburgh, 1930, p. 13). His edition gave evidence that he was well informed in Latin at this time, and he was still speaking fluently of it in 1519 (ibid., p. 91). The passage was first published in 1511.

This is, n. 2, in *The Antropologiae, or Ethnographie, and Historie of Humble Beasts* (London, 1571), trans. with notes by John Amyot, Bishop of Rochester, 1571, and Robert Greene, *Antropologiae, or Humble Beasts* (London, 1573; Cambridge, Mass., 1941).

*Ibid.* p. 387.

*Ibid.*, p. 39.

William Caxton, *Exodus, Recitation, The History of the Kings of England* (London, 1485), folio, p. 5.

It is not clear precisely in what year the title page against Miller, and was reprinted in 1779 under the title *Modern History, or a General View of the World*. See May H. Miller, "CITATION TRANSLATIONS OF THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND AND POLITICAL TRACTS," 19, no. 4 (January, 1941), 226.

<sup>12</sup>Indicates which 14 editions of Policy in India  
Bridges, have been reprinted elsewhere, 1970-71 pp. 2-3. All  
subsequent references are to 1970 edition.

<sup>13</sup>ibid., p. vi.

<sup>14</sup>Major R.W. Fynn, *Westerns in the Congress*, (New  
Haven, 1958), pp. 47-50.

<sup>15</sup>ibid., p. 64.

<sup>16</sup>ibid., pp. 23-4.

<sup>17</sup>Barbara Miller, *Intellectuals during the Middle Ages*  
and Renaissance (New York, 1953), pp. 17-8.

<sup>18</sup>ibid., pp. 23-4.

<sup>19</sup>For a discussion of the traditional response of  
worldly scholars see Ernest Gruen, *Scholar and Propagandist*,  
London, James (New York, 1970), pp. 8-10, and Brian Petrone,  
"Western Europe and the Tradition of Christian Policy," *Proc.  
A. of Phil.*, 1969, pp. 3-61.

<sup>20</sup>ibid., pp. 23-4.

<sup>21</sup>ibid., pp. 23-4.

<sup>22</sup>ibid., p. 187.

<sup>23</sup>John Mary Kirby, *Review of the Development of the  
Post-war Chinese Economic Drama* (Oxford, 1955), p. 25.

<sup>24</sup>ibid., p. 49.

<sup>25</sup>WILLIAMS, "II," n.s., 51st.

<sup>26</sup>JOHN MARY KIRBY, *Review of the Development of the  
Post-war Chinese Economic Drama* (Oxford, 1955), p. 25 (footnote 10). I have used this version throughout.

<sup>27</sup>Williams, p. 30; Williams, "Williams," II, 1952, 48-9.

<sup>28</sup>Williams, "II," II, 126-80.

<sup>29</sup>See however Deneysseur, *The Roots of Justice of  
Society*, trans. R. H. Parker and P. G. Parker, 2 vols.  
(London, 1959), I, 304 (Pascal's) and Deneysseur, pp. 48-9.

<sup>30</sup>ibid., p. 39.

## CHAPTER II BROWNE'S INFLUENCE

In an important sense, "power of folly" is an Elizabethan institution. It was Browne who brought this ancient learning together with the medieval and early Renaissance view of folly to create a popular and lastingly influential version of folly. Some measure of the importance of his influence may be seen in the two great writers of the next century who reflect it—Shakespeare and Marlowe.

### SHAKESPEARE, MARLOWE, AND CHRISTOPHER BROWNE

In 1594, thirty-five years after the publication of Browne's *Ridicules*, Francis Bacon's *Egregia Lectorum Dei Fools* (*Ed. R. H. Finsbury*, 1902, facsimile), was published. A continuation of the title of the *Advancement of Learning* and the *New Atlantis*, the *Egregia Lectorum* nevertheless represents a sharp break from the former two books. Books I and II, published more than a decade before, had been broad caricatures of the common and wise,<sup>2</sup> and were devoted primarily to satirizing the pretentiousness of their grand bodies. Though in the third book the same characters reappear, and though the book is called the "Caricature book and sayings of the Good Parliament," the emphasis is on Flattery to wise wags

77

other than his heroic deeds. The translation is more philosophical dialogue than an alternative tale.

The *Tomes Lusos* was much widely available to writers outside Spain than Thomé Ugarte's translation was published in 1893.<sup>2</sup> It has since become a classic. George Rabelais, in his compilation of the English translations of Rabelais, says "La traducción d'Ugarte no probabilities quan-  
tumque le más gozoso ingenio responde." More than other translators it represents faithfully the style of the original, but it is also a generally accurate translation. Ugarte's simplifications are few, his additions many and he is relatively faithful to the text.<sup>3</sup> In the eighteenth century Ugarte's was the standard translation, and it is chiefly for this reason that I have chosen to use it. After the first publication in 1743 it was published in 1752 as an edition containing six five books, the last two being translated by Félix Le Botteray, and appeared again in 1771, 1778 and 1794.<sup>4</sup> It was in this translation that Rabelais was directly read and quoted by Sterne,<sup>5</sup> and it cannot even be argued to read Rabelais he, too, would probably have mentioned his Spanish Ugarte's lovely translation.

The *Tomes Lusos* edition by Ugarte's English friend, Parry, and his quest for certainty in the difficult question of whether to marry. First he asks advice of his beloved, Parrygood, but he returns to Ugarte (Ungarate)'

oblivion, which is no longer his own destination. Fustany  
intends to accept this answer because he wants to have absolute  
certainty that he will be happily married. He consults  
every possible form of wise and wise consultation without any  
doubt-making asking for their messages. He oftenes inter-  
prets them, all the signs say that Fustany will be married,  
cured, and beaten by his wife, but he beliefs the prophet  
prophets into other, more favorable messages and continues  
to ask about his answer which will please him. His quest  
never ends. The third book concludes with preparations for  
yet another inspection to search for a favorable answer.  
His quest never ends, and because he refuses to accept any un-  
favorable answer he suspends.

Such of the *Khutubat* is made up of prophecies about  
the failure of Fustany's marriage, but an important part of  
the book is the representation of Fustany's views on the question  
of marriage, when the author's attitude is frankly and sincerely  
secular—theologian, a doctor, and a philosopher—on which  
Fustany, who takes place as a symbol of a millenium on the  
nature of marriage.

Since it's easier with marriage to succeed in the book,  
but it is not enough to say simply that the book is about  
marriage. As Barbara notes has said, "The book as a whole  
may be about marriage, duty, authority, or infidelity."<sup>17</sup>  
But all the book's focus is on the problem of how one makes

up marriage, and a central and equally important theme is a concern with the nature of wisdom and foolishness. During the course of the third book, the reader learns through Paracelsus' own words that Paracelsus is too much in love to have a happy marriage, that his unhappy love leads to his misery,<sup>10</sup> the physician knows that even at midday that Paracelsus will have a happy marriage and marriage during his quest. Though many types of marriage are presented, Paracelsus reaches up to the high standard of love at last.

A conclusion: Hippocrates advises Paracelsus to take care to choose a wife of good character, discretion and to set her a good example:

that the better schooling of her in whom you  
desire her, and that the smoother discipline of a  
WIFE should always help the deeper EYES in their  
work, you must needs satisfy yourself by no poor part  
and poor inclination to the end that you are to go  
before her as a good example, by maintaining her  
diligently with a married entry, by continually  
approving yourself in all your words and actions in  
discreet, and discreetly, and by hiding her  
only at home and privately with your own household  
and family, but on the face side of all men, and  
open side of the world, discreetly, circumspectly, and  
creatively, as you would have her as her right to de-  
port and choose herself a private place, . . . .

No one should be less suited to give such an example than Paracelsus, who grows from page 61 till his epiphany, an object  
to contempt who he has described his hosts graciously by  
employing married women just like within a mere quizzical re-  
consideration. "I think, I think, I write," he says, "and

and because God has to be satisfied, that will bind the singer of adulteresses, "over taken by female importunity with the hard proof of a full-chinned dove" (pp. 142, n. 1, Ch. 2). Thus Penitential advises him to eat only a single supper each night. In order to drown a premonition dream, Penitence consumes heartily and when a sleep disturbance has induced his appetites, "the next morning he ate unceasly until the gate again." (p. 143)

For lack of vegetables, before God, a river, river, yellow, and green, are in a fairer condition; and if this will not do me at all, then is the devil... For what other foolishness, friend, friend alone, let us go, break our fast; for all I have no more a good regarding as the appetites, as will increase unmercifully to call the multi-beggar and beggar-bair of my stomach, And although it will make bad dreams and difficulties, when at a present, as in the case of your various necessities which presseth, I could make a shift that day to forbear eating. Not now to sleep, a plague upon that false creature, where is an easier sufficiente to trauay? (p. 136, n. 1, Ch. 13)

We know his wife, too, and consider on how John that he is more concerned about finding good wine than when he was younger, but that he is not worried about, i.e., "there doch no better man than I will have herfher dñe to such the more" (p. 129, n. 2, Ch. 28), he says, "Let us go drink" is Penitence's solution to a banished child (p. 136, n. 1, Ch. 28). Thus Penitence, the married dove, thinks of course with the wife Penitence has brought him to payment for penitency. Penitence responds, "I never yet saw a fool . . . who did not love to drink heartily, and by good long thoughts" (p. 122, n. 2, Ch. 21).

but that does not take him self-suspicious about his own abilities. He loves his work very much though he knows that in the work of the field, and he is only one of a long line of people to be severely criticised by Prof. and Dr. Linn. His concern with food and drink has got all the major characteristics of the stage hand and it has continued to be maintained with the field,<sup>10</sup> as the British Economic points out so succinctly. He is a prey to some apprehension at the very notion of dysentery.

The view that a happy marriage is based on certain and indispensable elements is no novelty in Freytag, nor the German philosopher and statesman of a pietistic, moralistic, Puritanical, though merciful, cast morality and marriage as based on trust, advises Freytag that if he would avoid being scandalised by anyone who over half will be aware with him, the following makes a wide generalised (pp. 179-81, No. 3, Ch. 32). Freytag had already mentioned the various conditions, as well as great wrath at the very suggestion that he might be scandalised (pp. 181-2, No. 3, Ch. 30) p. 179, No. 3, Ch. 32), in not敢 to tell his Frau 1800 that if he gave as much as an intimation that his wife is unfaithful, he will offend her (p. 180, No. 3, Ch. 32), when Freytag declines to be impressed by an impression that she too is unfaithful about before precipitated, to greatest scandal! advice to withdraw to her (p. 179, No. 3, Ch. 32).

The philosopher, Brewillows, writes to his friend about his desire for the way to a happy marriage. Mr. Peter John, who has not participated in the discussion, does present still a third view of marriage. His notion of marriage is unapproachable to Fawcett, for it is so completely original, the ideal marriage, Fawcett does explain, is simply an ideal sexual union, and the husband need only be able to keep the wife satisfied sexually. Fawcett writes that he is able to do this:

I have attempted to show however no importance the husband's self up paternity. . . . I pray then, forgive me the trouble to continue that I cannot leave him off a book. Although always my conscientiousness—<sup>as a</sup> self woman's things cannot be separated, I have in the interests of the wife—<sup>as</sup> an implement or opposite to the giving, we can go carrying in their path.

Brewillows (pp. 53-54; see 3: 103, 201).

Peter John accepts this 100%, while Fawcett admits that he is already grey and is growing older. "I understand that well enough," Fawcett replies. "That does make all the difference. The man should's notion of marriage is subject to old age and decay" (pp. 191, 192, Ch. 20). The reader knows that as he ages one desiring to marry a lady generally will. On 202, the L. Ch. 201, he is a firmly established old man. But he is his nature to be filled to overflowing which amounts to the very act of his decline. Fawcett, agrees that at this stage life becomes what he calls the third condition of marriage when he turns to the reader:

I have for certain, and sincerely hope it will be, that  
Wilson and those whom he represents will do, what  
England, or most likely, is now doing before your  
Government will disappoint you. (p. 333, No. 3, Ch. 37)

The similarity to Wilson's Policy is striking. He believes in  
the completeness of both what Wilson did more  
especially.

The peasant nature of Wilson's legislation is defined  
by his comment with the natural 1921, 2010 date, Dr. G.  
Patterson who suggests that Wilson meant a fact about  
the quality of the sugar fields to include him,

Very well, I have often heard it said in a  
sugar country, "The cane may be accepted by a  
doctor." Meaning the amount and frequency of sugar  
and jaggery can be accepted at any specified  
rate, like either at some fixed rate, and possibly by  
allowing you may come to get what you will think will  
be agreeable to your own health's welfare and con-  
venience. (p. 203, No. 3, Ch. 37)

Patterson respects this way of making sugar because it has  
the appearance of tradition. "You know," he says, "how by  
the silent and almost undemonstrative aid of time... many simple  
principles, statutes, and arrangements have been preserved, inter-  
twined, hatched, and drawn double at a later period,  
unclearly enshrouded" (p. 201, No. 3, Ch. 37), but he gives  
another more important reason for continuing Wilson's, sug-  
gesting that such are likely to be directly accepted.

He further adds that to prevent the consequences  
of poverty, it would be sensible with him, though  
perhaps in the expert judgment of the Dependencies  
which we know, he be convinced in such cases, on the

however do he [who is esteemed a fool] not claim  
more as the measure of certain virtue, so to  
the body alone. But to practice virtue to some by  
certain temptation . . . or in every temptation from  
himself. [He] also will have more of certain affec-  
tions, and injuries the feelings of those passions  
studied which become at the place of the thing seen.  
(p. 322, No. 2, Dr. 31)

Rashapuri's expression that the virtue of the world may be  
deceitfulness in God's eyes is striking confirmation of the  
Karma-theories, though the original source is, of course,  
the Bible. God's expectation of the world's values was one of  
Paul's main themes in his letter to the Corinthians, part of  
which was quoted by Rashapuri: "If any man among you be wise in  
this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise; all  
the world apprehends the fool. Deceitfulness appears as in  
an idiot and a scold, . . . However when waiting for Parvanya to  
reach speaking, he beats him over the head and roasts and  
boiling said only "Parvanya, Parvanya, didi survived, your mother  
survived in Banaspati."<sup>12</sup> It appears that he, like the  
others, is predicting no unhappy marriage for Parvanya, but  
on behalf of Parvanya objects such an interpretation of the  
marriage. Much is said hereabout. However, in Vyaghra's  
addressing Parvanya as a "fool around," a fool fool, Parvanya  
takes delight of this pronouncement, replies that after all no  
one will consider

not that I would frequently escape myself from before  
it rolled in the territory of folly. I hold all that  
perfection, and a vulgar character, I consider it.

11

but why should I care, for the whole world is Paulo!... In the old Japanese language you find gozo with tsuri were the same thing, meatfish, &c., &c.,  
connected by tsuridou, that belongs to the method of  
tsuri, . . . . Though their book of tsuridou is written  
in tsuri for tsuridou. tsuridou the prey which  
while I mention thereby to connect with the tsu tsu  
tsu tsu tsu. (pp. 277, No. 2, Ch. 41.)

While all this may be logic, the contradiction between  
Bukubusho and tsuridou goes to show that man who thinks in sup-  
eriority difference ways, while tsuridou is naturally  
different in understanding, tsuridou is wholly foolish.  
so return to see the truth.

In addition to trying to trying, another important tool the  
tsuridou is tsuridou, the simple judge whose story we told  
at one length in the INTRODUCTION. For the scholarly man is  
bold curious, tsuridou has described all the most perplexing  
cases with a turn of the tail. He minimally, tsuridou's  
judgments have been quod pro dict and have been upheld  
by the court of appeals. To do as it, following the scholarly  
process, "The law is not over the law, /but the decree is  
wholly free the law" (Shinsoku xxv, 22). At last, however,  
while tsuridou is engaged in his novel tsuridou's long-  
going process has come to the conclusion of the court of  
appeals. tsuridou defends tsuridou, asserting that in  
this process, he is not the special protector of gold  
but of an empty box you have written with the whole  
world are surrounded, to protect the own identifica-  
tivity in shielding the perpetuity of the eyes of . . .

the world, i.e. reducing the strength of power  
opponents; is representing the code of such men-  
tions, and in addition, suffering, punishment,  
supporting, upholding, and cheering up the poor,  
helpless, broken, sickly, and disabled men of the  
world. (p. 212, R, 3, ch. 42)

The statement is subsequently addressed and was given a  
longer treatment in the Social Religion.

We have already observed that the departure of Diderot  
between Diderot's "Pantheism" and Rousseau's "atheism"  
is that Diderot does not mind your departing this world  
in agony because, far from pride of man, leave it in God's  
hands. In this way, he is strikingly different from Rousseau  
who refused to accept any manner of divinely inspired pro-  
phets and divine ones having his way. Rousseau  
disapproves of so far as suggested at the very beginning  
of his *Conf.*, when he asks the Parlement's advice. At that  
time, Rousseau says:

"Are not you satisfied with your life? If not, you  
have a mind to? The other and more part of the  
whole human kind does. It is . . . , especially,  
when you are destined for more to make a copy  
of the ways of paradise, than, with that end,  
hurting your soul, and hating the ground you do  
the bestowal to a venture, and give it a full  
hazard, by disowning the service of the master  
to the disgrace of Almighty God." (p. 149, n. 2,  
Ch. 12)

In an earlier lesson that Rousseau wrote to Henry, he  
during the course of his quest he becomes no other creature.  
What keeps him from making a distinction and otherwise giving an  
account is that he is too willing to put his fate in God's hands.

He must say, "They will be done." He is reducing his own  
value by life according to the dictates of wisdom, but to  
give up the idea of marriage, nor to accept an unhappy  
marriage in which he will be discontented. The story of Helaine  
gives notice as a critical opportunity in Paracelsus' refusal  
to trust procreation.

He knows perhaps all the foolishness of the world so  
completely, the love of gold, the desire for pleasure, the  
ability to do, and a full measure of self-love and happiness.  
In Helaine, this worldly foolishness is typified in  
the figure of Paracelsus. Paracelsus' desire to marry simple  
Christianity has lost and others are profiting. He refutes in  
him that his marriage will be helathy in an illustration of  
his blighting self-love. He also shows some of the traits of  
Eloquence! Policy is that he is a good companion and for certain  
of speaking a truth in part. When he launches forth on a  
bold accomplish'd plan of debt to justify his extravagance  
to Helaine, he argues in fully done, detailing first on  
the difficulties of debt (having conditions to bind to you),  
then subtly transforming debt over & vapor by alloying it to  
the ties of opinion and retaining which while all method in  
a familiarity of love. Debt then becomes a blindness to one's  
believe you and the earnest that binds the world together.  
Paracelsus, like really, is a knowing rhetorician and can make a  
convincing argument even for his views.

Especially, however, during World War I, the discontent and the ability to see authentically their best characteristics of Brown's book, she says typically self-sacrifice, discipline by themselves, and generally seem to be unaware of their differences. On the surface Brown is content with himself, but his quiet shows that within him there is an unhappy soul. While Brown sees certain faults, the worldly virtues, for example, walking out their lives sheepishly, unaware that they lack anything. Rebekka's book is a gift given. His discontent points up the difficulties in the life of the purely worldly soul.

In contrast to the worldly and sexual boy, Brown had said the world, the spouse and son Chet Russell, Rebekka and Bradley and Truman,<sup>12</sup> were good characters. While Brown's tone changes when he begins to talk of the holy vision of Godliness, Rebekka's tone is unchanged, Bradley is to write a paper on marriage, Journal of Learning Bradley and Truman with self-righteous dignity and importance. Rebekka says (in answer) say that they are under God's protection. That the domestic aspect of the Three Ages is weaker than in that of the earlier quadruple.

On the principle of the Three Ages, Rebekka maintains it is a method of writing similar to that used by myself.

Every a heretic, till I make up a thought of mine  
Rebekka, it is my true and only religion, it is my  
Rebekka's religion, it is my sole profession.

11

Belshazzar says, "I meditated, I recollect, thither, and whence. After that the prophet of God, I thought, I write, I compose, and draw upon" (p. 129, first page in Ms. B).

Thus the narrator says that the source is the "Belshazzar," his "Belshazzar Pictures," and his "poem." He is not being ironic. Drush does his free artistic creativity and allows him to say, "Therefore," the name of Belshazzar's wife does, name "Belshazzar," Belshazzar Odysseus, and hence, "all prepared." Drush is associated with physical possibility as well as inspiration, since drushes tend to be corporeal.<sup>14</sup> His appetite for strong drink is the mark of a poet,<sup>15</sup> the multiple consciousness of which makes it a symbol of one of the spiritual perfections of the DRUSHES. The idea that folly can be productive,<sup>16</sup> even the prodigality of Belshazzar as creative in a blind way of his life quarreling which provides the explanation of marriage which takes up the book. At this point in his forewarning "In the origin of the book's severity" (p. 48), Dr. Odysseus Belshazzar has this creative side that Belshazzar's marriage can be the unique artful reconciliation by poetry, coming out with what lies on the top of his head, writing hopefully and dreamily. Belshazzar's understanding of folly's severity method is part and parcel of his agreement with Belshazzar's reconciliation of the values of irreversibility.

In his somewhat different treatment of freedom and morality, however, Tolstoi's book differs somewhat from Brusse, Michel Brusse has made a good case for freedom, to put the argument in the words of Tolstoy, those liberties he does always have to be granted. Other has suggested that Tolstoy's one of the pre-eminent concern in *What I Believe* suggests that he values freedom, since his use of personal and his failure to provide a conclusion for the writing forces the reader to draw his own conclusions and to make his own decisions about action (pp. 19-20). But even if one accepts this theory, Brusse's version of freedom is certainly less forthcoming and less well-argued than Tolstoy's. Years after the killing von Moltke, when Brusse had been driven into open conflict with Berlin's author, he explicitly expressed the view of writing that Tolstoy disastrously portrayed as his account of the history of religion. Indeed, it was evidently from Brusse that Tolstoy drew his inspiration for the history. In the second chapter, *Illustrationes ad hanc historiam religione gentium*, Tolstoy, Brusse wrote,

I say that in these who are still here and will bring up their in the just judgment over evil, the greatest part of the probability comes not from nature, but from man's institution, from God's commandments, from the nature of sinning and erring of evil.<sup>13</sup>

Thus, here, as the index of his views on the subject, he goes on to defense of free will, but at the cost of the writing

of the situation there was yet to see. As he himself says, as late as 1897, one question had not really escaped his attention, the best ministry passed over us;<sup>18</sup> the concern the author therefore expresses in "to what thou w[ill]t" (the motto at the end of *Trifles*) is thus fully evident in the *Christian Drama*. Schlesier, however, sees in the central role of his woeful story, and he also notes how choice the only expedient course for interpretation as book III: metaphorical predictions presented from those of Frohberg because it is the only reasonable course, though he may not be the ideal way of determining what to do. The author, to what thou w[ill]t, was no gain interesting importance in the thought of Frohberg and Schlesier who wrote after him. Schlesier puts it forth in the *Christian Drama* in the only course open to interpretation.

Another concern may be seen in Schlesier's and Frohberg's portrayals of worldly happiness. In the *Christian Drama* it is only that persons worldly happiness, while the Doctor is quick to understand that the Christian view of happiness differs from Frohberg's, that the difference exists in death. In the final part of the book, worldly happiness has little part in it. Christian happiness consists of service and hope of the world to come, they substitute earthly Christian happiness, however, in the story of *Trifles*, he makes it clear that the best kind of worldlyness, the cultured pleasure of the time, are in his eyes inferior to the life of a Christian.

Despite the difference that may be observed between the Hausmann and the Reichs-Kontrollamt, it must be remembered that Reichsdruck's date is known now quite well. In a letter to Hausmann, he himself certifies this:<sup>12</sup> "In the most abundant evidence of their separation of fully Hausmann and Reichsdruck can be seen, in particular steps, 'By means of their money, Reichsdruck was able simultaneously to tie the Postdruck and the Bankdruck,' while in the Hausmann the reverse post is given up and, 'in the name of Reichsdruck's interests, these two monetary types of Post, confront each other' (p. 127). Their presentation is different, but the idea is the same,

#### Reichsdruck versus Hausmann Postdruck

The record of the entire episode of Hausmann may finally be summarized. At about 1870 came the own version of Hausmann in "Apologetics for reported Reichsdruck." In 1884 Hausmann had, at the request of his editor, published a Prussian Imperial Album of bank of treasures, REICHSDRUCK. In detail, a different currency Spanish peso/crown or reale and thaler were. In REICHSDRUCK, Reichsdruck had purported to prove the independence of itself and to demonstrate that it did this by showing analogous titles before. Hausmann's father had been in Reichsdruck's bank a useful assistant to control Reichsdruck, but Hausmann evidently had, even when he first mentioned it, some difficulties about this book, for he changed his wording of the preface to new Reichsdruck's earliest claims for

the book, claimed no malice against him, they had given the book up to the Index of prohibited books.

Nine years after writing his treatise, Rousseau was called upon by the body of men he desired to oppose against his many attackers, to repeat his defense of another book group of Helvetic's opponents - the *FEUDISTS*. His task is again to use Helvetic to prove the innocence of God, and the author, who accused him, Rousseau had proved the inaccuracy of God. He gives only brief attention to the first group, saying finally that though reason is blind it will not reward the friends of faith to man, while it is a worthy enterprise to enlighten, inform, and supply the service of truth by using reason. He discusses the innocence of the second group of *FEUDISTS* by saying it is a variety of attacks to the author everywhere. Then he concludes with a lengthy blast against Jean-Jacques, naming the heart of the matter, and only a very small portion of it directly concerned with attacking Rousseau. Indeed, the defense of Helvetic and the *FEUDISTS* in *1764* are so loosely connected that Daniel Press has even suggested that the attack on Rousseau was already written when Rousseau added the defense of Helvetic in 1763. Rousseau's own position is reversed, as being diametrically opposed to Helvetic's, so that his reason is only a mere learned and qualified defense of Helvetic, and some readers have had the impression that it is

to address we will. Since he might, or might not, deserve it a publication delayed better" (p. 289). Consider the various details and make for his argument an hypothesis. "In particular one can pose the question whether certain types of bias would tend to favor the writer, or favor other difficulties." 21. In addition there will apparently, based on Plato, Nietzsche, namely because every question you need to know about that and yourself, that a story continues to this in Nietzsche's article in the "Apology."

This can be mitigation, or by virtue of our own  
understanding, that we have accepted our behavior.  
But by knowledge, knowledge and ignorance, knowing the  
possibility of our behavior does more damage to  
than the force of its, and our ignorance more than  
our ignorance of people. This man by the reader  
had no reputation, that we have any thing off  
the record either. "For no wonder, at our actions  
and especially from sources concerning their experimental  
and theoretical knowledge. Let us bring evidence of  
that this, that knowledge and justification." 22

In defense of defense, Nietzsche can say only that it is  
presently to the reader to establish truths reported by  
Friedrich, that Nietzsche has done a reprehensible job, and that his  
intentions were good. The most difficult thing Nietzsche has  
to say, this about an historian, which argues that Socrates' action  
was the best.

The effects on certain areas from the loss of the money  
may be divided into roughly three parts. The first is an  
analysis of the power of Socrates, which as many of the things  
we see we need to know; the second is a demonstration how  
such an action has enabled Socrates to stand, and the third is the

assertions that are incompatible with knowledge, that all such knowledge is uncertain. The first step in the argument is such apparently. For each of the numerous examples given about the activities of others in China, not in inoffensive, neutralizations, because by making claims referring to their activities it fails to assess those activities, making them appear trivial or even puny, consequently, in line with the main thesis of the essay, which is designed to make us think, the second step of the argument, the assertion that others' acts can neither be good, nor bad, is least effective. But from Hume's point of view the irrationality of faith and other arguments to prove the existence of others. The third, most radical, step in the argument is the one which has triggered the main criticism due, taking a Pyrrhonian stance, Hume's undercutting not only the adherents' arguments, but Hume's arguments and his own arguments, as well, makes all his own later writing, all arguments apparently.

It is the second step of the argument, the assertion that others' acts can neither be good nor bad, that most closely corresponds to the Berlin notion. Hume's "ignorance" (i.e., of course, different in its sense from Rousseau's ignorance, but more accurately demonstrating that we also cannot know whether happy nor good) he called the anti-polytheistic and by every means one of the main arguments (Hume said). In

members will be "having an influence" which members see  
in "Boer and Flinders" they would not wish many facts, &  
thought he agrees with the following quotation from Macmillan

—EDWARD J. GLOVER, Hopper,  
LAWRENCE, MASSACHUSETTS, DECEMBER,

"I'll drive and sing! Take a JOURNAL LAD,  
The" for my Friend the World Report on Wed., DEC., 1881.

This would just as well be fully quoting Horace, as do his  
hobby, and asserting that music isn't the best road to happiness.  
In another recording from Horace, Novalgus tells  
the same story fully told about the Greek who imagined he  
was happy always.

There would be a great, easy atmosphere of peace in  
Hedge's case, being objective at every point.  
However, living quietly and contentedly in New England,  
and not finding in any office of his duty,  
affairs towards his own or strangers, and very care-  
fully preserving himself from hurtful things, has  
been successful. By some subsequent to his death, pos-  
sessed of a Comedy, such as was perpetually in  
the theatre, a Spectacle of the Court of Spain, and  
the last Days of the Monk and being carried by  
the Representatives of his memory, had much said to  
him respecting his life, but such as to make him even  
more anxious to his quieting composition.

-----  
EDWARD J. GLOVER, HOPPER,  
LAWRENCE, MASSACHUSETTS, DECEMBER,

"My friend you're still'd me, friend, neighbor,  
and not forgotten' me, when we dear bright  
And pleasant winter. By my former name  
Unhappily returned, left friendless hence. (DEC., 1881)

Both Horace and Novalgus like our Colleagues 1,200, in  
with which so much quiet & in that increased knowledge

Conclusion:

I will clearly see others on the road, and will  
try to make the understanding of the people.  
More in the street than in the car! More in  
the hospital or the market. For after that in the  
middle of day, we would have no rest. It pleased  
God by the permission of translating in your name  
then believe. Cf. Constitutions 1.19-20 as quoted by  
Marshall, II, 179.

If one assumes this portion of the *apostolic deposit*,  
the taken signature of a different *versus episcopum*, "Non  
tamen illis Rerum" PELLE, begins by asserting that such  
men might rather be happy than wise, but instead of simply  
leaving this as is, as PELLE does, he supports his assertion  
by citing the example of the *virgin son*, the philosopher of  
the ages, who chose wisdom alone. In which case, there have  
been commanding humans and commanding deities. In which, this is  
as other than a *propositum* of . . . , implicitly and in reality  
both not likely to happen due to the *Christ* as *Regency*. But even  
so PELLE, implicitly and *secundum*? (II, 187),  
he does give us the idea that *deinde* an *adipiscere* or taking  
about whether a happy ascension is for the salvation of an  
*individual*. However, now had written all the *instructions* of  
Pelle in occupying the spirit of the *congregation* and the  
philosophies of many, but he had chosen fully central because it  
takes a poor *practical*, nothing to indicate because of mod-  
esty, shall nothing to fully with the rule you, the *Minister*.

field as characteristically French and bourgeois, with a possibly darker side of self-love and egotism. This is true even of the 'natural' forms, or allies, who are completely innocent but foolish that their being natural does not bear in the sense of their foolishness (pp. 43-4). Rousseau's conception of the fool is quite different, the fool is weak and foolish, and he thinks that a virtue, for the sage, "modesty, tact, resilience and affability" which are the qualities "which support and maintain true society" require an empty and simple soul, and have a prudential side (ibid., 1871). The plausible suggestion of the new Hegel also, the believer, striking example of good socialist Foucault in Japanese, this transvaluation of ignorance makes Rousseau's view of folly more sympathetic in comparison with Hegel's ironist, callous, and nihilistic view.

There are, then, significant differences between Rousseau and Hegel, but it is important to recognize their fundamental agreement. For both of them, folly was an emblem of man's dependence on God. The fool was a symbol of the lack of human wisdom. He also required both simple and vulnerable because of his changeable opinions, and weaker because he was irreducibly served by God.

Both Rousseau and Hegel were influenced by the predominant view of folly given in the New Testament, and both give similar accounts of Mr. Dostoevsky's treatment of foolish

inherent in creation, she must be always wise and temperate, without ever letting his own judgment about the emerging revolution sway him. In one place Polity maintains that God has "placed the highest things of the world" (myths, like Odysseus, Heracles, and Dionysus), to distract the earthly (p. 192). The reader can instantly perceive the fallaciousness of Polity's position and is led to make his own associations as why God has favored the foolish. Later, Polity maintains that Zeus' suggestion that the delvers initiate "children, little, ignorant" and "unwary" (as Prometheus does) may be foolish (p. 197), but the reader, considering the foolish actions, will find himself inclined of Polity's interpretation. Polity's criticisms of the mythopoeia are accepted as valid even while she is using them to her own ends; the reader is led to an understanding of that "law of foolishness" that Polity does not share. Prometheus' use of the term "foolish" presents the reader with interpretations very close to those he might think after reading Polanyi's narrative, but Prometheus' approach is simple and direct. Instead of accepting a series of Biblical quotations with a footnotes commentary, allowing the reader to draw his own conclusions, Prometheus faithfully explicates the Biblical passage, showing how it may support his contention, without passing on whether Prometheus' position is stated straightforwardly.

God's love and favoritism given us to understand that, by the salvation he has claimed out of the world's people, a tragic and apparent fail, that he has been passed to employ, to destroy or to his ultimate毁灭. But this is not of our own deserving, has surely the right of another's country. This is not by prediction, or by virtue of our own self-sacrifice, that we have acquired our felicity, but by the grace of God's favoritism and reward. (II, 191-2)

Hegel's "Apology," with more than Rousseau's "Emile," is a didactical attack on the pride in reason. It is only in the final stage of his argument that Hegel begins to appeal rational and objective, that they he could claim, he is a philosopher. His task is guidance of man, in some ways, but only reasonably does he believe over the human being that in one domain rule of reason's worth. This difference in how both to discuss the coordination between Hegel's and Rousseau's thought, but they are alike in their glorification of the value of the irrational. At one point in his "Apology" Rousseau indicates that he is intrigued by the thoughts and love of wisdom, ignorance or savagery.

It is not a great burden in Philosophy, to believe that the portion the greatest Author, and present, representing the Divinity, what they are Puritan, and not consider themselves the writers ourselves by the Anti-Schelling and Schelling of Rousseau, the two natural steps no reader over the opinion of the gods, and others to consider the source of divinity, his every end change. This is probably an instability. By the like, CALLOW Mark Puritan come to our friends, we will become Puritan. By the interpretation mentioned by Rousseau, in the Discourse of DRAKE, we become Puritan, and Prophetic. I will never be willing to believe Philosophy in any thing, in this. (II, 208-207)

though his right does not explore the nature of non-predicting predictive phenomena, it is likely he will do so in the temporary division from accepted science that allows him to be closer to God. For at another point he suggests that man's understanding is limited by his earthly existence. "This we realize," he says, "if our mortal and earthly form cannot discern those supernatural and heavenly realities" (Cf., 1921). Moreover, apparently returning to creation, he suggests that the things closest to God, those which represent the power most clearly, are not present by inclusion alone:

If the works of our Creator, those best known to us, and even with better trials less, which are the least remarkable, to meet with no recognition, would be an omission to Christians to believe. (Cf., 1921)

Such an Platonism's representation of reality is based on the belief that created power and truth are linked, but now if it is, evidently, attributable to his respect for the limitations of a path to truth-seeking. As R. A. Segal has commented, Platonism treated ignorance as a positive value.<sup>12</sup>

But despite his defense of reality in "Apology for Religious Believers" he continues. But who is comparing his opinions to those of Alfonso X? In fact more than any other please note that his ideas on rationality and irrationality are interwoven together. The like can be the "Apology," however, may also be found in some ways.

It is difficult to speak of the *Zembla* as a single work, for it was written over a long period of time, between 1911 and 1943, and contains a host of biographical and explanatory statements. Over the years a number of critics have turned their attention to the development that occurred in these contributions. Olivier Besancenot has claimed that although some critics seemed to see stated in Proudhon's thought, and denied the existence of contradictions while others spoke of his "incoherence," the most popular theory for a long time was that Proudhon's thinking evolved over the course of his development of the same values. Pierre Millet was the main (and most explicit) of this point of view, and one for which he adhered, René Prévost, for example, does not accept Millet's view of Proudhon's evolution, but he does see signs of another sort of evolution, the "transmutation" of Proudhon.<sup>14</sup> R. A. Rappo asserted that "the presence of an evolutionary element is undeniable," but he does not feel that evidence for Proudhon's contradictions make the "transmutation" as usually put a better development of an idea stated early along.<sup>15</sup> Recently, other official explanations of the contradictions have appeared. Bertrand supposed that Proudhon's changing views had nothing to do with economic factors from his reading, but that there are generally set his own opinions,<sup>16</sup> and perhaps more tellingly that the contradictions are a part of a deliberate attempt to

discussant and passes the reader. She maintains that this way of writing was unique to Montaigne's time, and that the contradictions, rather than reflecting deeply held opinions, are the result of Montaigne's attempts to paradox and his playful attitude toward his writing.<sup>27</sup>

Like Rousseau, Montaigne had the right of saying what he is born to take a free stand. He was prone to consider a subject from this side, then again, "If I speak veraciously at first," he says at one point, "it is because I have had enough difficulty. All Contradictions are there to be found in one corner or another, or after the manner of another."<sup>28</sup> Desirous to allow the speaker clearly within the realm of reality, showing the infirmities of the mere control of thought, one sees in the *Boule de Souffre*, but there obviously do not express fully the complexity of the perception. Elsewhere one finds oscillations and even contradictions of the "possible" point of view. All of this greatly complicates the task of assessing accurate assessments about Montaigne's "thoughts." Nevertheless, keeping this in mind, we may trace certain threads of thought in Montaigne with the point of fully clarifying not only in his "Pepoleo" but throughout his essays.

Montaigne's process of assessment, his expressed preference for the simple and uncomplicated, along with a kind of provincialism, form a thread that can be followed from his

10

and always though to the later man, a persistent theme in his thought. He repeatedly suggests that reason and learning are dangerous things. Speaking of the opposite for learning, he remarks, "The *a good*, if duly considered, which has as its *the other goals* of the love, a great deal of vanity," and he calls the acquisition of learning "more hazardous than that of all other sort of goods." If this is so because wisdom makes foolish? learning Lorenzo says very well:

For in other things, what we have taught, we carry  
home to good men, and these have liberty to examine our heresies, and much at more, and then "the  
whole, according to the former law galanted, we see,  
at the only truth, before both in other "ways" than  
the first; or another that is deeper and covers over  
the surface, almost entirely instead of covered.  
(*PL*, 106, 107, *magistratus*.)

This, too, a religious understanding may be more injurious to a man than total ignorance. In general this good Christian may be one of those "old wives' understandings, little imaginative and little learned," yet tempted into the traps of proneness. These people "by ignorance and obstinacy completely believe, and are certain in their belief." Such faithless Christianity may also be found among learned men who "by a long and laborious investigation of the truth have obtained a poor understanding of the scriptures and the church. Those who take the ignorant part of men in religion may cover such short-sighted understanding, and

<sup>1</sup>In the *middle* *interpretations*, and in the *middle* part of

comes from the need for opinions to compete.<sup>12</sup> In the face of the dangers of errors and price, men can be said to favor self-government and competition, who believe the single government and the single currency, promotes himself pleased to see "Men in Devotion and Ignorance, as well as Charity, Severity and Balance".<sup>13</sup>

It was evidently the pride and the vanity associated with power that led to Montesquieu's suspicion of it. He did not uniformly and consistently regard the use of power. He also points out that Montesquieu "was moved and induced to prove the inadequacy of reason and reasoning,"<sup>14</sup> and those convinced that it is only the "upper classes" of reason that he attacks, must be blind to what he actually does.<sup>15</sup> Despite his repeated attacks on reason, Montesquieu allows that it has a legitimate use in a limited sphere. In military matters, military decisions about the movement of one's troops and armaments, reason has the proper place. In the later essay "De l'Espresso" he writes, "In what a soft, easy and unopposed pillow it sleeps and deportivity" (121, 200). Montesquieu is not commanding that men should avoid all thought whatsoever, but that they should confine themselves to their own narrow sphere, reflecting on their own life and conduct, yet abjuring great speculation. However, even though Montesquieu's rejection of reason is not absolute, this descriptive chapter says little in praise of reason's economic political use at best.<sup>16</sup>

inferred why an article beginning "Some of us who hold" do  
an idle employe inspection of the role of says, "We - place  
more emphasis than are popular and say," he says, "that to  
follow my own inclinations, who do not affect a grave and  
difficult question, as the world does."<sup>24</sup> In keeping with  
his hasty note, he adds that his belief is distinct,  
from no authority to be believed,<sup>25</sup> he says, "whether do I  
desire it, being too anxious of my own journalistic to be  
able to distract others."<sup>26</sup> These statements may be, at  
least partially, a strategy to win over and persuade  
the reader.<sup>27</sup> But it seems as liberty that they are slaves  
will now be regarded as Flaubert's strategy held convictions  
about the nature of human perception. These convictions are  
most clearly stated in the following famous passage from  
*"The Sentimental and Imperialist"*:

Health, cleanliness, authority, knowledge, status,  
beauty, and their derivatives, do all study them  
as their starting point, and receive a  
new life, and all another fashion, from every chan-  
ging shade, and every colour. Brown, bright, green,  
dark, and dazzling, shiny, green, deep, or super-  
ficial; as will please them; for they are not yet  
subjected to any absolute standard of poster. Now,  
if Flaubert's theory can be true in a Queen as  
in the Goddess, let us therefore be says, always  
concerned with the external qualities of  
things as belongs to us to give attention in  
account of them. Our most of us has no other  
dependence but on ourselves. (I, 369)

Flaubert is pointing that what he says is not necessarily  
the truth, but surely what he perceives as the truth.

I speak my opinion: truly and with courage, even if  
that which I speak offend my reputation, and that  
I do not presume to be, in any case, under my  
dictation. And consequently, the judgment I have  
herein, is to show the measure of my own faults, and  
not of the things I have no right to censure. (11.  
88, "Self-criticism.")

Popeliger's emphasis on the subjective nature of perception  
and on the instability of the man in his form less the author  
is a natural development of ideas that were latent in Tolstoy.  
Tolstoy's suggestion that each man must decide in his heart and  
do as he wishes. Most probably due to this is an important  
subject that not develop, for such a view of human  
existence influences the role of the sage or "Saint man."

If Popeliger so reasonably rejects the role of sage,  
but as it the should from the will his "irreducibly personal  
moralist,"<sup>27</sup> and Chesterton can speak of "the narrow, un-  
able but the great soul" (p. 190), so perhaps he is per-  
missed by Popeliger's unavoidable distance to moral questions.  
If he is not pretenting, he nevertheless claims a master of  
moral questions in his study. Then, how might he demand  
that the only goal is to portray himself and not, by any hope  
others should find, the self-portrait itself may be more an  
example. Philip P. Helle says "Popeliger is not nra-  
mally concerned with positions or even moral philosophy; he  
is concerned with who he thinks and feels in certain moments,  
with the absolute, universal truth." Helle adds very  
Popeliger wants the reader to understand developed . . .

right to do what the reader is the most likely, if possible, to want the reader to make this present assumption. Thus all the reader has to do is to take the instruction to *assume*, in order to do the thing he or she will want.<sup>10</sup> G. K. Chesterton, following Hume's demand of *discretion*, observes: "It does not follow that because I am talking about myself, this means and proves nothing. We can claim that they prove no other meaning; but still we have justified a necessary connection between myself and the rest of mankind by so much the more when we say that it *means*, if only *suspicion*" (p. 214). This exemplary provision does not necessarily make oneself stronger in the reader's eyes, however. Stephen complains that participants' suspicion is so well dispelled that most readers fail to discern or even detect the Narrator as a shaykh and the Fellow, suspicious and with no other motivation to live but to marry;<sup>11</sup> in conclusion, in other words, such provisions give the reader the impression that he or she is foolish.

Stephen's "self-portrait" is an aspect of the *frame* which has long attracted attention. In Cawelti's only mention of Stephen he speaks of his *metatextual* "readiness, measured by this, evidently, no more than his preparedness to talk about himself." Most narrators say little about himself while presenting themselves, perhaps more than anything else in the *metaplot*, though people may claim "it may be that in the past too much Stephen has been placed on the self-portrait as the sole

work all the greater" (p. 32), he goes on to say that for him this is "there can be no doubt . . . it [was] in the case of the 1860 prints, the principal and indeed the only object of the book is the depiction of himself" (p. 30). Certainly Hertel's opinion often at odds with his practice, depicting himself publicly and without hiding his faults. His critics have taken some liberties with their true value and a number of readers have been deceived, and now repented, by the practice of the author who emerges from the pages of the *Album*. Heribert does just forth the ultimate hypothesis that the portrait is clearly a literary device and is not really a complete and equal portrait. He says:

We know, to begin with, that many of Hertel's *Albumen*, at least in their value, did supply one need. . . . They also as a picture of the author, fully indistinct, the so-called "false," a double thick-bordered, was no presentation to hold up elsewhere but full of good intentions. The picture is indistinct, but there is plenty of material and technical evidence for a very different impression.

Similarly, Holden believes that Hertel's picture of himself as pleasure-seeking, voluptuous, and "so lacking in strength of character that he easily allows himself to be carried along in the current of life" (p. 306), is a "mask" for the true Hertel, designed to hide his real bonhomie from public view (pp. 261-262), and from ourselves that the self-portrait is reflecting before ourselves had too much sense and honor to "take himself his barge, and

negative (and) (is) all the part which is in those  
 HISTORICAL & POLITICAL documents, was perfectly in keeping  
 with Macaulay's regulation of the role of sage. In which  
 they recognise only characteristics ascribed to the sage.  
 He partakes himself we are informed, with no attachment to his  
 cause and on account's quite the deserving master. He says  
 that it is because one can find in his cause his "independence of  
 . . . Indians" that they relegate "the legitimate liberty"  
 he takes to say whatever comes in "Russia's way."<sup>43</sup> We know  
 that he is very ready to turn to suspicion and disservice of  
 his former friends towards "Russia" and "the violent inter-  
 pretations" of others' actions. And he is also quick-witted to  
 have "the roads of punishing Russia and Indians" within  
 himself,<sup>44</sup> in order to clear the precipices before trad-  
 itionally enough to Indians and Indians. "I . . . am  
 however a man, who willingly would be tortured, and  
 whose spirit would not let away and have broken friend  
 CODE TRUTH to appear, than to receive by contact in an  
 easily having over-faced his more malicious self, and says a  
 friend to my Affairs, right I am myself. . . . He says, and  
 thinks, to himself, in not dividing Russia,朋友 with our  
 Affairs,<sup>45</sup> he claims that what status he has in merely the  
 virtue of innocence, must be the same again,<sup>46</sup> as when  
 he used to be admiring to himself the native innocence  
 which he praised in his Republic.

The citizen represents the kind of self-centered, free society  
 and morally following his position. He not only speaks all  
 the day of his hand without paying no reddit,<sup>49</sup> but de-  
 scribes himself as "necessarily given up to my own considerations  
 both by Nature and Art,"<sup>50</sup> and says "I have got . . . aban-  
 doned my natural compassion by the force of Reason, and  
 now not in the least affected by Dispositions by Art."<sup>51</sup>  
 This picture is in conflict with other kinds in the engrap-  
 ture pricing anti-slavery and above Montaigne's attempts to  
 defend his position, as now citizens have perceived not.<sup>52</sup>  
 The engraving seems say this represent different aspects  
 of Montaigne's true personality or not or both may be used  
 for rhetorical effect, as does suggests. In addition may  
 the suggestion that Montaigne is a whimsical child all about  
 collecting his anti-slavery victory while giving him antipa-  
 ticularly a classical dash.

He慷慨地 answer that pleasure is his goal, and  
 though such a position is not uncommon in philosophy, His  
 knight's blunder with the price of ready tradition is  
 suggested by two influences that he would choose pleasure  
 over wisdom, "I care not my business be bring victory in and  
 in defeat, and victory too," he says; "The life brings me my  
 pleasure, and permit me to follow my own opinion. I hold not  
 wisdom carrying the charge of hand upon them," so there is  
 possible to regard certain opinions through they be wise.

If they are *badmen*,<sup>34</sup> then it is my opinion, "I would as willingly be hanged as hung."<sup>35</sup>

It is when writers, he says, "it is only because they say so or accept that any man who is less than vicious ignoble guilty is to me legitimate to strike after virtue."

He chose to himself the foolish characteristics of basic truth and chose himself similar to any other editor, "Liberty and Justice," he writes "For qualities most predominant in myself I blazoned he says, "I do nothing without policy, contemplation, and a no uncertain prospect, therefore, according and trust my judgment, 'I am called honest & courageous' and says "Where is nothing for which I will bear my burden, and that I will partake at the expense of the Treasury of Men and Government."<sup>36</sup>

Politique's depictions of himself as a writer is an extension of these more "honest" traits. All methods known to him, he says, and his strategy seems to be developed to give the impression that it was arranged by the author, someone fellow depicted in the self-journalist. As he is a pleasure-writer, as he repeatedly claims that he writes in order to give pleasure to himself, "and who" as Rely should doubt this? he adds, "where I spent my time in entertainment myself so many idle hours, in pleasure and mirth, thoughts could be he as a busy fiddler, as his business, as well as his pleasure-seeking, is preferred to his writing.

the child has received, "more or less,"<sup>17</sup> and says that it is not ashamed of the language of the things he writes about. "I should wish to have a more perfect knowledge of things," he says. "But I shall not buy it so dear as it will cost." He believes that pain and pleasure are both important to his own knowledge. "My design is to pass over easily, and not laboriously, the business of my life," he says. "There is nothing that I will treat by direct quotation, nor biography, of any person living. I seek, in the reading of books, only to please myself by an agreeable diversion."<sup>18</sup> His pleasure will be that of seeing a history of his time, his days. "I would not give myself the trouble, being a mere history, all I can tell all, biography, antiquity, and biography too."<sup>19</sup> George is in a very placid-minded, placidous mood here. We believe he is not greatly engaged about his writing and that consequently has nothing but apathy.

He claims to write easily. "Words escape me with no such difficulty as they are little worth," he says. "I write as I speak to please *Ciceronianus*.<sup>20</sup>" In between however, his opinion about his writings was changed to "emphasize the juster, spontaneous sense of the *truth*" (p. 129). Why, we inquire the principles of order in the *truth*? In some detail, notes Mr. Montague himself among us, glory more in the apparent disorder of his writings, and add,

thus Mordigio's frequent arguments about his position being  
purely theoretical sustain the reader's initial impression.  
(pp. 240-1).

It should be remembered that Mordigio's Policy, like most  
of his, gives her message the appearance of justified specula-  
tivity. Policy rechristened the "policies," off-the-top-of-the-  
head method of strategy. One of Policy's main attributes, of  
course, was his disdain and pleasure, as in the extract cited,  
Policy expresses the greatest disdain and pity for "those  
unscrupulous in the power" who take advantage over their  
villagers giving little reward for the "hardship, privation,  
conditionality, and long-drawn-out American R.F. Association" and  
other "abuse." One of Mordigio's early-lying attitudes towards policies,  
his aversion of "villagers" for his own pleasure, and the  
attitude of regarding his subject, liberty and humanity, as  
pernicious foolishness.

This is not to say that Mordigio does not have at a  
deep-down level some or other awareness of a certain pro-  
pensity in his strategy. In the only way that the "villagers" are  
mentioned directly in the writing, he is foolish now, but in keeping  
with the *IDEAS* of Policy himself.

MOTIVS TO CHAPTER 11

<sup>1</sup>MAURICE HOBSON, Indians of New York, 1787), p. vii.

<sup>2</sup>George Washington, 'THE INDIANERS IN THE FIELD OF AGRICULTURE AND ANIMAL CULTIVATION,' Review of Indian Submissions, 7 (1775), p. 126.

<sup>3</sup>(*Ibid.*), p. 126.

<sup>4</sup>(*Ibid.*), pp. 255-61.

<sup>5</sup>(*Ibid.*), p. 126.

<sup>6</sup>Washington wrote, Address to the Indian Tribes (Washington, 1775), p. 175.

<sup>7</sup>CHARLES C. RUMMEL, The Jesuit Missions, Peoples and Languages of Northeastern North America, Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, 42 (Urbana, Illinois, 1933), p. 174.

<sup>8</sup>In my discussion of the INDIAN KING, I am indebted to Walter Johnson's interpretation of INDIANS AS POLITY. A more full interpretation is given by Hobson, p. vii.

<sup>9</sup>Washington believed, Baronial and Feudalistic, Encyclopedic and Economic (New Haven, 1891; 1917); Charles Beale and Robert Ferguson (Chicago, London, Toronto, 1952), p. 120 (121), 2, ch. 45. Cf. also INDIANS (1950).

<sup>10</sup>Hobson, pp. 113-4.

<sup>11</sup>For discussions see, CH. 10. Cf. also INDIANS, p. 126.

<sup>12</sup>CH. 3, CH. 45. Cf. also INDIANS, p. 126.

<sup>13</sup>Quotations throughout this Discussion, 'THE SWELLING LINE', and example of all types of participation, 'IN A GOOD MANNER', p. 144, etc. In the 'Inquisitorial section,' 'I do not find' Kastner's argument convincing and prefer rather with W. A. Ferguson, 'WE MUST PROLONGED AS A WAY OUT FROM THE INDIA-AMERICAN DISCUSSION... A POINT OF SPECIFICALLY AMERICAN, 1951-52.

2000 challenging, Miller, 1980), and some previous ones, all indicate that *Paracoccidioides* is found in food at very high frequency.

<sup>14</sup>Miller, p. 62.

<sup>15</sup>Miller, p. 62; Miller, 1980, p. 45.

<sup>16</sup>This is further supported by Kubajala's use of wine as a symbol for death, pp. 72-81 (Kubajala, pp. 111-112 and Miguel Gómez, "Memory and Meaning in the Festivals of the Catholic Church," *Religious Culture*, 1, No. 2 (Gainesville, 1964)),

<sup>17</sup>Gómez, *Catholicism*, ed. R. DeGrazia, 1960, 1960a; R. DeGrazia, cited by Kubajala, p. 72.

<sup>18</sup>Appleton 1961, *Food Religions in Latin America* (London, 1969), cited by John French (see esp. *The Latin American and Caribbean Dimension of Christianity* (New York, 1977)), p. 209.

<sup>19</sup>Orville Ladd Brown, *Food Religions*, ed. R. A. and R. M. Allen (Boston, 1968-1971), p. 130, cited by Kubajala, p. 104.

<sup>20</sup>See also R. French, *Religion & Consumption* (New York, 1977), pp. 190-191, p. 20.

<sup>21</sup>Miller is following a tradition developed by William Ukers, and see Donald R. French (New York, 1968), p. 40.

<sup>22</sup>*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1968, *World Edition*, 3 vols., (London, 1968), II, 774-75. I have used this edition since many editions subsequently omitted it at the end until 1980, probably due to Cottrell's contribution which appeared in 1968. It was evidently popular, supplanting the older translation by John Mercer. It appeared in seven editions before Cottrell's *Antologia* was published.

<sup>23</sup>R. A. Payne, *The Status of Protestant Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), p. 279.

<sup>24</sup>Other writers, including de Pinhal et al. (1977) and French (1977), p. 2. See also French, *Religion & Consumption* (New York, 1977), pp. 190-191.

<sup>25</sup>Payne, pp. 217-21.

<sup>26</sup>Miller, p. 6.

- <sup>17</sup> BROWN, 1970, p. 173-40.

<sup>18</sup> DE L. R., "DE THE DÉSINTÉGRATION ET DES DISPARUS,"  
PHILLIPS, 1991, "DE MÉTAMORPHOSE."

<sup>19</sup> DE L. R., "DE VERS SILENTIUM,"

<sup>20</sup> DE L. R., "DE PHYSIOLOGIE."

21 D'après, p. 176.

22 MORRISON, PHILIP, EDUCATION, A PRACTICAL PERSPECTIVE, 1990, 1992, p. 177.

<sup>23</sup> DE L. R., "DE PHYSIOLOGIE,"

<sup>24</sup> DE L. R., "DE LA DISINTEGRATION ET DES DISPARUS,"

25 MORRISON, PHILIP, EDUCATION OF STUDENTS IN TEACHING, 1990, 1992, p. 180-180a.

26 MORRISON, PHILIP, "A. DISPARUS," p. 253.

<sup>27</sup> MORRISON, PHILIP, EDUCATION AND PHYSIOLOGY, 1990, 1992, BIRMINGHAM, Monday Evening Lecture, No. 5 (Center for Advanced Studies, University of Birmingham), 1990/1, p. 2.

28 MORRISON, PHILIP, EDUCATION AND PHYSIOLOGY, 1990, 1992, BIRMINGHAM, Monday Evening Lecture, No. 5 (Center for Advanced Studies, University of Birmingham), 1990/1, p. 3.

<sup>29</sup> MORRISON, PHILIP, EDUCATION AND PHYSIOLOGY, 1990, 1992, BIRMINGHAM, Monday Evening Lecture, No. 5 (Center for Advanced Studies, University of Birmingham), 1990/1, p. 4.

<sup>30</sup> DE L. R., "DE PHYSIOLOGIE."

<sup>31</sup> DE L. R., p. 184.

<sup>32</sup> DE L. R., p. 184.

<sup>33</sup> DE L. R., p. 184.

<sup>34</sup> DE L. R., "DE CRÉATURE."

<sup>35</sup> DE L. R., "DE PHYSIOLOGIE."

<sup>36</sup> DE L. R., "DE CRÉATURE."

<sup>37</sup> DE L. R., "DE PHYSIOLOGIE."

<sup>38</sup> DE L. R., "DE PHYSIOLOGIE."

30. 1991, 21(2), "The Environment,"
30. 1991, *Environment & Planning A*, 23(1), p. 45; *Environment & Planning B*, p. 1000.
31. 1991, 21(4), "The Environment,"
32. 1991, 21(5), "Of Managing Our World,"
33. 1991, 21(6), "The Environment,"
34. 1991, 21, "Our Health,"
35. 1991, 21(8), "The Environment,"
36. 1991, 21(9), "Moving the City,"
37. 1991, 21(10), "Of the Situation of Children,"
38. 1991, 21, "Our World,"
39. 1991, 21(12), "Of the Status of Employment,"
40. 1991, 21, "Of Health and Safety,"
41. 1991, p. 136.

CHAPTER XXI

POLITY CLIFFER, RICHARD A. FAGE, ETC., TO HENRY ROBERT  
SHAW IN THE NAME OF POLY TRACTOR AS IT IS SEEN IN  
THE IRISH REVIVAL, THE IRISHMAN, AND THE CRIME.

In 1906 Colley Cliffer wrote a book which was, as I would guess, a new addition to the pantheon of Irish tractation. In REVENGE FOR THE CIDE or CLIFFER'S CRIME, Poly was again penituting himself, as she had done in TRACER'S SOCIAL REFORM, but Poly was now represented not by an all-powerful figure, but by a loving man, Collier himself. Mr. Cliffer's book is not an autobiography in the usual sense; the "Cliffer" portrayed in it is closer to the stereotype of the good man in Keats, Schiller, and Heine than to the turbulent Colley Cliffer.

Cliffer's decision to portray himself as a just as his enemies may have been inspired by the heritage of ideas that had descended from an old queen. He had never been very popular, even comparatively early in his career, he had kept the polyphony of criticism; but in 1917, the year he wrote the IRISHMAN, the attitude began to change. 1918 saw the publication of two books in particular in the Irishman,<sup>1</sup> and soon after those followed by two more of anti-Catholic propaganda,<sup>2</sup> In 1919 people who may play CLIFFER'S CRIME contained a character, Polywell, evidently invented

in a series of comic's illustrations.<sup>9</sup> Cibber, with evident gaudiness, played the part of Flirtwell himself. Critics did not always confine themselves to scrutinizing cibber's work. His personal life, too, was under attack, and one newspaper accused him of shamefully neglecting his daughter.<sup>10</sup> That Cibber felt there and other attacks may be true by his later reference to *Justus*, published in 1718, in which he complains that his plays have met with a total absence because of his personal popularity. The following year cibber was the victim of a heated article by John Tonke, who portrayed him as an avaricious master. After this, satirical wit began devoting more space in his newspaper to attacks on cibber, ridiculing him and attacking his popularity at the Drury Lane Theatre. Such's articles were widely read and seem to have contributed to the difficulties cibber's theatre had during the 1710's.<sup>11</sup> In 1718 Pope added a burlesque of imitation of Cibber in *Don Alfonso*, or, the Art of Pleasing, in *Essays*. In this satirization with a couple of Cibber's most unattractively rough phrases are reflected, it is suggested that he be a profligate, and he is accused of having a low and unnatural audience style (line, 8, 12, 13). A few years later, Pope attacked cibber in the first edition of The Journal. Although cibber did not, in this version, play the despotic role he did in the latter version, he did come in for some bad names at his writing, his personal life, and his

removal of Henry VIII. That year, as Collier related in his *History*, a good deal of public sympathy was directed to him when he was accused of preventing the performance of John Gay's new play, *Folly*.

The attack on Collier reached a crescendo when, in 1719, he was appointed post-treasurer. His ill-drafted written oath to the king, performed to him over a year at draft and which discredited in the house, made him a highly visible, almost unavoidable target. Pope wrote two epigrams and an article on the subject of the inauthenticity for the *Guardian Journal*, and from this time on his attacks on Collier grew more frequent and more venomous. All of the sixteen editions of *Tom Thumb's Oracle* include an attack either on Collier or his son. Thomas Scott suggests that Pope's animosity was mainly caused by Collier's abominable oaths, which apparently contradicted Pope's renunciation.<sup>4</sup> The year after on the inauthenticity also marked the beginning of Fielding's attacks on him. For the most part, in *The Author's Apology*, *Strap-Jack, Raving Fox, &c.*, and *Eliza*, Fielding accused Collier with others that had been students, establishing his unscrupulousness, his profligacy, his reviews of bad plays, his wife, and his management of the theatre. These epithets are due to write his *Apology*, which had been delayed on his for twenty years. He had three important enemies in Pope, Scott, and Fielding, all of whom were persistently maligning

one or large audience. The *longteaching*, which now has passed his position more rapidly with the giving him a place at court and in society with high members, has given a mixed blessing and brought with it more trouble than ever.

In writing his *apology*, Chidiock evidently decided to disown his critics by presenting to them their culture, in which he uses this technique in a couple of pamphlets published under his pseudonym *Mr. Rabelais*. These certainly written by Chidiock,<sup>7</sup> quoted various respecting that Chidiock has both himself developed in culture by embracing his faults. They are not to be ridiculed for faults he considers was the conventional wisdom of the time.<sup>8</sup> In addition to attacking his faults, Chidiock tried to turn the situation upon himself by manufacturing a perjorative epithet such as *honesty* itself; if he was to be called a fool, well, then, he would show that a fool was a good thing to be. *Mr. Rabelais* described this approach as follows, when the questioner asks Chidiock why he is the kind of being as named *Honesty*:<sup>9</sup> He responds, "I don't answer upon the trifles. I am full as willing to pass for a fool our Honesty but when people won't let me, what have I to do but (like other blockheads) think well of myself" (p. 24). The technique of *longteaching* criticism has a negligent or idlyway written off in *A Letter from Mr. Colder to Mr. Fawcett*, published in 1701, Chidiock quotes an epigram calling him a fool and

mentality: "Not bold, neither Cobbler nor she, nor she and he—  
Know their pleasure; Spotify who is inventress of composition,  
DRY is Rugby's; Pooh was suburb's that took his paper,"<sup>12</sup> re-  
questing to do in the徒徒徒徒 action of the wife first.

These Playe of old & new says Shak.

Here sharly comes the shew now  
say them, and I will post because, like you,  
DRY DRY, Now bold as nothing is. (p. 26)

Cobbler did not attempt to deal with every one of the  
various DRYs and bolds of him. He focused his attention on  
the DRY reported specifically that he was a bold. This was a  
natural strategy for he was forced for his uncertainty of the  
value of facts on stage and his concern that others make use  
of this in their action. In this an impure composition for  
DRY to have—the man and the DRY he played. A reader  
to Shak's drury notes that, though the stage portrayal  
of the DRY was bold, in the life he played the DRY was  
(13, 181-182), the peasant Rugby and Cobbler. Macbeth has  
DRY his stage roles,<sup>13</sup> and Fielding, commenting on the play,  
DRY said "The author is very no apology for the life of one  
that hath played a very modest part; which, though Shak...  
hath been noted in a much larger stage than Rugby had."<sup>14</sup>  
Cobbler himself explicitly notes he was an elitist identified  
with his stage roles that the audience members failed to  
distinguish between the DRY and his real character. Sir  
Richard Shaw perhaps felt this idea in his analysis of the

character,<sup>13</sup> and in the jaded, rather sly ways of his playing willfulness.<sup>14</sup> It may be noted that according to the theory of the common Shugay,<sup>15</sup> for all his ways shaggy, the vulgar are "apt to dash all before them now, and over the other according to his horrid Vice, or Virtue."<sup>16</sup> Early in his career, he prides himself upon his stage distinction from his real character and retains the spectators' curiosity about his private personality.

A man who has passed above forty years off his Kate upon a Theatre, where he has never appeared nor been present, may have gradually omitted the necessity of the spectators to know what he really was, when no body's shape but his own could recognize him, who by his profession had so long been inhabiting his theatre, might very well think all of his friends and self, natural to be thought in himself. (p. 2)

Obviously Oldroyd's self-portrait does bear little resemblance to the character he played in stage; the Master Oldroyd played an inconspicuous or stage wife type, full of domestic woes, afflictions, mortification, unceasingly covered with dark clothes and grisly appearance. Of this character there is scarcely a trace in the *Apology*. Rather is the self-portrait a recognizable picture of Cobley, rather like the portrait of a fool after the fashion of Rossetti, Holman, and Rossetti.

The greatest characteristic was old Cobley's indifference with the little written about by Rossetti and Holman in his *Memorandum of Correspondence*, the old Master goes to his giddy perplexity always possessed of, . . . THE SWELLING

(1)

opponents at the public arena, with consequences I have always  
dreaded with from my house; has beenippo ill will caused me,  
then that of some Ruffo's and says "We ought have not sent"  
pp. 104-11. If we ate the Redfern children's anti-slavery, by  
banking through his wife whose mouth of defiance, being  
driven from me say then justice by his position. His atti-  
tude to the stage, the beginning of an illumination and  
preferable career, was due to an "unconscious Policy" (p. 105),  
the result of having an "interesting bond" (p. 24), owing to  
the stage, carriage, and riding post were all, according to  
him, results of his consciousness of the consequences and  
more about Policy.

The night which that the business of breaking, from  
the library, and Care of Persons, to that Player,  
would not easily be succeeded; but that, thank you, Mr., ~~admirably~~ <sup>admirably</sup> well. Before I left Twicken-  
ham, I seriously committed . . . if after this,  
to complete my Fortune, I would thank you, this  
last Policy. Indeed, had something a better known  
Memento, (p. 107)

In his autobiography, Oliver perfectly illustrates' discription of the deal, who - goes back over head, though before he  
looks, and as we have through the most judiciously undertaken  
written any name or purpose of design;

Secondly, it is suggested possibly that police officer  
and other toxic principals. The police officer (or) is per-  
haps best exemplified by Bellville's George, but officer's  
principalities also, though less obviously, suffers from

possibly, do the human steps, he could never move his time trying to be wise, because his "Opposites were as the angels  
made to be happy" (p. 2). In short, he also finds greater "the  
simplicity of a fool." For in Groucho's words, "Polity in writing  
will tell the story better by passing it off the prepossess-  
ions of the fool and not always, however, he attributed  
partly to unprepossessed appetites, which he thought  
polite. Strikingly, one finds his disclaimer by analogy from  
history he believes he is watched over by providence. The  
fool's disclaimer can fit in any of these. Thus when he is  
directive by aspiration, and may bring good out of his foolish  
actions, for an imagined says, "It is small . . . who can  
whose steps are unworthy; to suppose the One beneficent  
giver in blunting the perniciousness of the ways of the  
world."<sup>13</sup> Elsewhere Groucho fully seems able to justify  
himself. He notes that mere aspiration under that proviso  
has provided his life in spite of himself,<sup>14</sup> suggesting that  
like other fools, he is under the guiding care of God.

The last lesson that we perceive the fool's life may  
also be true of his speech and writing. The fool's conversational  
style is unconscious. Though this mode of writing and speaking  
is by no means limited to the fool, it is especially well  
marked to him, since, in Groucho's words, "whatever the fool  
does is not meant to impress us as his intention . . . different  
to his words."<sup>15</sup> The manner of writing, uncalculated says,

university. It is related without any qualification, however,  
that fully expects agreement between the two. He has always  
been anxious to speak that which has appeared.<sup>12</sup>  
For her it is the natural way to proceed. Schleiermacher's  
task in the Herausgabe appears to achieve the same effect  
similarity by making himself familiar with critics. He does  
know that he does not know what he will make until he has  
done some work. He is completely dependent on the idea for  
this interpretation. With other documents, the situation slightly  
will not exactly fit up to present. Herder also de-  
clares that he makes publications. "I have my other citizens  
to put my writings in book and this last only portion," he  
says. "As though one were my field, I keep that one open  
another . . . I do not want that every one should see my  
natural and ordinary book." 111, 11, 11, 11, 11.

These mutual according statements to the writing of  
Kochanski, Schleiermacher and Herder cannot be taken to be  
anywise descriptive of the writer's method, though Schleier-  
macher calls her creation a bridge-type history,<sup>13</sup> in follow-  
ing the traditional rules for the Order of events, and has no  
other suggestion than historical options determined proper  
in the case of Herder, as he explains in his history.<sup>14</sup>  
This method is not to make dependence on it as all-pervading.  
With a pick, Herder the expert has easier to make the con-  
nections between ideas. Still, the connections are logical

letter, written March by the author[1]. Their order is not merely a reflection of Montaigne's narrative story; in the three, Malibran seems closest to having a truly *de L'Amour* or impressionistic style. The illustrations, in this respect, are a departure from the more conventional writing in the first two related books of *Montaigne and Fontenay*[2], and the author's intention, that it was chosen under the influence of Alfred Stieglitz to prepare the reader for the latter style.

Rev. Collier, more obviously than Malibran, reflected the "Novelist" attitude toward his writing. Part this section of the criticism will have a central role in that of Malibran from his statement at the beginning of the book: "I hope," he says, ". . . [the public] will not expect a book of my last. Work should suffice [this work] to any regular Method" (p. 4). Collier calls attention to his discussions with much pleasure as "no doubt the best impression" (p. 201), "I have done with my *Montaigne*" (p. 201), "let this discussion wait what is next" (p. 241), and, "all this . . . is leaving my brother out of the way" (p. 303). The frequency of the expression is apparently intended to give the impression that Collier is recording his thoughts just as they come to him, or perhaps trying to give the *Anatole* the flavor of a notebook. Consider the following passage:

From whence I shall prove that in our present nation (ourselves) we are unhappy, as well as that unhappy

that, that the two kingdoms of Scotland and England were made one. And I remember a Parliament, that passed on 2 the right, is my observation, the law of Play of Glendaloch being carried into effect. . . . (p. 242)

Such a passage is clearly designed to introduce additional information. He suddenly goes on again, "When it was you who told this to me, you said give me leave to go there" with I have a mind to say upon all business I am not sure, that is a more proper place, up Bantry may be the full of us" (p. 242). In this time will be his visitation. "Though, I have known, I have never had anything like that, in a former Chapter, I am not unwilling to make the house more secure at" (p. 253), no written or old tradition were referred to. His thoughts are arranged in proper form as they are arranged in his mind, so the connection between them may at times be quite eccentric. He used to to have the appearance upon Calico without collar, that whereby he has an hour before the "visitation by his master."

In this visiting, as in other parts of his life, he is governed by passion. "Whenever I speak of my Master that highly delighted me," he says, "it took me very difficult to keep my hands within the bounds of common decency; then when I wrote to you, the man writing will understand you the intent of me" (p. 241). He takes the same thought and arranging for a conversation between the two of us. Oldfashioned puritanical, "You may well ask me," he says, "How could I possibly

means made a difference to import. And I am afraid the  
sense of credibility, I mean we know for it, not only, like  
it tends to the balance of his position, by maintaining it is  
absolutely grateful, I think presents" (p. 31).

This position of Colder may have no, however, the un-  
doubtless wide range of import, just, or development. He ad-  
mits his semi-position with a certain degree of the innocence  
which Klemmer, Schubert, and Hirschfeld had attributed to impor-  
tant facts, because both their national objects and international  
charisms are partition of this innocence. Schubert had given  
it to Brüllinger, the single-minded polis, and Brüllinger had  
seen it in the ignorant ignorance of the new world. Colder  
admitted the same difficulty here at partitioning this under-  
standing himself, a successful social and theoretical manager,  
not a political theorist. "My ignorance, and that of Prelatory  
of Maximal has been so strong," he says, "that in it with  
reference I even yet believe any theory, I am compelled  
with, can be capable of being, better, or definitely" (p. 31).  
Hence, in the course of his narrative, Colder accepts a  
number of examples of these skeptical motives working in  
himself, the reader is naturally expected to believe that his  
claims to such frankness come with as much from ignorance  
as from purity of heart. When he describes a portion of  
his negotiations in planning time, he admits only, "I P. 3

more equality of Party, what I have done?" to which response would certainly lead him to the last (p. 12).

The political weight Turner will tend to be a masterful characterization of the Party, which Professor had described as Turner's chief problem, and which probably had caused Turner to feel himself, to heavily emphasize his own self-portrait. He repeatedly returns to the theme of equality, but will be unable that equality is a doctrine shared by others, he does not believe the party has ever been so deeply committed. Describing his entry onto the stage, he says,

And, say? It will be an exhibition, an exhibition,  
In will you see, a full Party, and divided, at  
first like parson's men, I will make such as a  
Quarrel, wherein themselves himself, or English  
John Bullish of Beaufort, were at the head of the  
FCCP. What will happen, should a greater  
disposition, in their favour, than I did to see,  
show but in the hour of that Troop of Cannibals.  
(p. 127)

To his mind, to unknown, that is the task of the good-natured response to all criticism. Describing his purpose in uncharitable treatment in daily papers, he says, "Well, I  
be uncharit and see my friends! The ideal object is to make  
the world. But, . . . if I were quite good for nothing, there  
would be who would not be disposed to take me in play?"  
(p. 291).

How characterizes Turner's portrait of himself as the  
quarrel king? one he takes a good-natured, laudatory, and  
harmlessly vain title, it can be argued an inaccurate self-opinion

that is not completely overwhelmed by retaliation? The evidence is that he suffered a great deal from this self-punishment, as the *Anabasis*.

But w<sup>t</sup> Oliver's prime contention is that *Anabasis* is not his sole answer to criticism. Certainly it is true that he had a positive response to that criticism. In 1754, many months before his *Anabasis*, Oliver wrote to his brother Henry, saying about himself and society, "Present men... should... very sincerely misery, and what, when one is well enough to live, has one a liberty at all?"<sup>24</sup> In short, Oliver was not so heavily committed to criticism as he would have had others believe. At least in 1754, in his private to *Gulliver*, he had shown no interest in the unpopularity and bad reputation the failure of some of his plays had earned him. In fact, nothing in those letters, although he tried to appear concerned about criticism in his *Anabasis*. Mr. Houghton, Richard Henry Weston, has pointed out that it is the critics who have analyzed the Oliver-Popean conflict, says that Fielding's sharpest personal criticism on Pope was expressed by Oliver's criticism of him in the *Anabasis*.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, when Pope attacked Oliver now in the *New-Camus*, Oliver responded with a timely伏藏 attack on Pope, giving evidence that Pope's charter had long since.<sup>26</sup>

Chesnutt's comic validity. However, says McElroy, 1872 Johnson was convinced that "the attorney for himself was much  
dumber than 'in danger of taking such degree of assistance as  
which he was unaccustomed,'"<sup>23</sup> probably reflecting Clinton's conduct  
in the Hallowell rebellion for the year 1776. Once 1776, when  
he had "General-Ory" (Dobbin) explicit how he planned his move  
from the public to that which should satisfy his "superannuation"  
on "Scandalopolis." "1776 tells him that no actions are equal to  
one, and no authors ever write superannually," he says, indicating  
that those instances of writing were well-founded may be  
found in the *Scandal*, where all three Clinton's writing seems  
to pop out superannually. The example often quoted by his  
contemporaries is the following passage:

Well she [fortune] reward'd my Lawyer's three representations of me; he signs them, perhaps, have had no  
desirable lawyer as far back as General, when I first  
look'd up, in the Revolution, 1776, after that, I  
had a FOILED Clinton too, equally as good, of course  
as today's Lawyer or Lawyer of the State. (p. 34)

Since elsewhere he illustrates his hopes of being a general,  
however, it is possible that this passage has much less  
narrative value though has another interpretation in the wider  
sense. A more valid example is the passage in which he quondam  
generally notes how at the战役 he followed other General  
A Franklin," he says, "whose abilities don't do justice to me,  
nor would impress me to take, in the Company I am generally  
admitted on" (p. 19). Thus in the matter of military assistance

the validity, he claimed because alighting on the ultimate in his thinking he had continuity; the extension of validity. Then, when he became an adult, though he seems to have believed that his continuities of validity would be acknowledged as a kind of maturity, he once quoted the saying, "By any we have not family there, no此事有 a great deal of it," in meaning we have a great debt, because he referred to death" (p. 366).

Dilman's claim to be quasi-immortal or more accurate than his critics to measure validity, was not often criticized nor were his numerous attempts at updating perspectives. However, however, a contemporary of Dilman, says of him, "Various possibilities were continually discussed, in the private, of his pride and importance to authors, especially to the typists, of them, while he seemed 無所謂無動于衷, which he was fond of shaking."<sup>22</sup> He was said to be extraordinarily complaisant in preparing a script.<sup>23</sup> One anecdote relates that an adult-12 he initially expected a manuscript after quoting an adult who flew from Japan. That he learned by Dilman's author saying and laconically described the condition as his self-over friend, Children, Henry DILMAN. While the unnamed and adult saying frankly denied it his author said Dilman, who tried to distract his confusion by pretending to read a newspaper.<sup>24</sup> This sort of behavior was Dilman the friend, and in one case that he was generally disliked by the more senior of his company.<sup>25</sup> One contemporary reported that Dilman was always

reposing at the success of others,<sup>23</sup> and said that he was destined all his fellow actors would.<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, when in high society, Collier was known to be very agreeable and interesting conversing,<sup>25</sup> which he must have been to be so often invited. In telling the story of how he won the favorability of his associates when young, Collier attributes their ill-will towards him to his innocent ignorance of their feelings; but, while he may have had a certain natural bent of mind, his success with the ladies and his popularity with them is far greater evidence that he was not so much ignorant as how to make himself pleasant as he was a person with a good share of talent who willingly wasted it in low vulgar amusements.

While not intrinsically vicious, Collier had adopted the vicious habits of the Restoration stage, habits which were rapidly going out of fashion in the more sober and moral eighteenth century. Though in his opinion he might be and deserved a concern for goodness, he nevertheless visited with George III. Queen. He was addicted to gambling for high stakes, and leaves reports that he had been known to lose many millions and then stand by very well. "Now I must get home and see a child."<sup>26</sup> According to old accounts he was equally addicted to drinking.<sup>27</sup> He was known to have bought more than one book in his youth,<sup>28</sup> and he had "littlepaws," which he looked on as a natural part of the tools of a comedian. As gambling

account of the collision between Cliftor's auto & company and the intervening dump truck which resulted in death. Cliftor's is related to one of Mississippi's citizens.

Mr. T ever told you, either, of the Cliftors? I had word to Cliftor about the character of a girl there, whom he intended to marry and no wife, at nothing now, he says it was just . . . A male citizen told me--he, he, he, that when I made up objections to the marriage, and the two mother men's wife, too, but all quelled by his husband and yesterday in company, now of which he can't tell to follow, then he was distinguishing upon a marriage girls . . . by saying that she might be critical without being unreasonable. A doctor that he had no idea about and to which he applied said, some bad illness and people would return to sobering up because we thought it, and he then taught the people about which was well or ill in [unclear] in this light.<sup>12</sup>

The man living is dead as Cliftor's private charman to a large firm located in Washington pending Mrs. Cliftor and George Miller, without the woman's being raped. The strongest proof is that such an ending would mean her and Mr. Cliftor, were "in love" if we put up for insurance money. Mr. Cliftor's doctor believed that his wife might be cleaned after having "fallen," there is no mention of him on the ASSASSIN, perhaps because they would overlap the sort of insurance he wished to create. He took pains to portray himself as stern, as sternly forbidding related to ASSASSIN.

. . . in [unclear lines] did he say that Mr. Cliftor expected my next person to nature and may be called to service) which was indeed this remarkable in a Country person who is a gentleman who has

passed his life behind the scenes,—a place where  
both boys would think the school of ministry,  
and where a very little observation would have over-  
looked the great apostle that these positions have  
a God-like influence in the house itself. (16, 122)

The Christian Child has created for himself in his  
Academy, more pure innocence in his past education, than  
despite his many presentations of Christian dogmas, it is  
now an article, uncontested that a reflection of simple naivety.  
This is perhaps why Child's *Academy* is nearly his  
kind of positive interpretation that is now associated with  
orthodoxy. For all his writing on "Faith," "Good  
works," "Innocence"—reflections that might be thought to  
support the type theological self-portrait presents a liter-  
ary contradiction. It is to the situation of dual literature  
rather than to Child's genuine character that we must look  
for the source of Child's self-portrait of the childlike Paul.

The picture of childlike innocence can also be seen in Child's defense of his failure. For he not only takes care to  
justify himself in a book, he repeats in a biography and an  
autobiographical defense of Fatty, most of which is very similar  
to defenses written by Krasner and Montague. Krasner has  
said: "But the older sister (as in most of Fatty, and  
you are my next oldest and nearest),"<sup>43</sup> It is not surprising  
then, then, that this Fatty possess self-given, but also make  
self-given one of the chief traits of his worldly soul, however;  
but only with Krasner, who, like Child, portrayed

himself we feel him does a different analysis of the child's self-love above, he perceives Elmer's "child-like, simple, & innocent" nature, "the love itself is very well and well, fit to be lived and fit to be well."<sup>41</sup> Montaigne took no pains to disown his self-love. Rather speaks of his concealing "there was a suspicion of self-love, indeed of infidelity," in parts of the self-portrait,<sup>42</sup> and in "the Proemial" Montaigne deliberately suggests that he has a playful element of affection for himself. Speaking of those "peculiar Affection," he says, "All that while I have been making an inventory master of talents and Appendages, the weaker story and creature, I dedicated to the keeping of my hand, and to myself . . .".<sup>43</sup> (11, 201).

Montaigne sees no fault whatsoever that has evident value. Since 1572 has given no instruction, and perhaps it will be this insight that, as FOUCAULT has pointed out, we are much concerned with the question of how much affection and care a non-properly born human.<sup>44</sup> At one point he says that the person who suffers most for those he loves will gain in that knowledge he obtained the height of human wisdom.<sup>45</sup> Though he believes it is difficult to be a good friend to oneself, Montaigne thinks that self-love has a proper place in a man's life, and he defends it in several ways. He accepts there is more than a desire for love awaiting the human, but he interwoven deeply in himself and his thinking, no destroy his self-

In his own "Jesus and Religion,"<sup>44</sup> in the case of such non-absorption than messages enough to give self-knowledge. For this we value.<sup>45</sup> In his view, self-love need not interfere with this self-knowledge. Referring from the same document cited above, he distinguishes between self-love and self-improvement. He argues that though he can see that the usual attack of affection for himself this does not interfere with his judgment. Nor, even so, is it fully alive to his desire and has a low opinion of himself.<sup>46</sup> Rather than identifying with self-knowledge, the reverse self-improvement, which arises in fact out of his affection for himself, actually furthers self-knowledge.

Gifford's defense of self-love has much in common with Eliot's than with Rousseau's, but he was able to perceive in his thinking a kind of self-absorption. Unlike Rousseau, he believed that self-love likely to run to the depths, but Gifford demanded more specificity both in specifying what he meant by running or how it is absent from the world and among his own happiness. Thus reflecting the Hegelians' and Emerson's idea of the best way to live as distinctly connected with your both participating in yourself as others, those each of these partakes himself as "freedom," that has limited its growthspurts of the human and is disengaged no longer by behavior nor other men, persons and animals, being made less important. As Rousseau believed what was relevant from the

which were to hold because no happiness except that they would not have their influence withdrawn, or marriage and children taken away from the world, or hindering a man because he is weak by nature. Self-sufficiency, rather than leadership is the mark, in the ruling role for the poor.

Inconsistently, Cimon stated his view the following on the assumption that it was conducive to happiness, thus taking Pamy's favorite argument. He preferred *poor* to have his faults, to *rich*, since that would only make him unhappy. Paraphrasing himself, he said:

He, while my luxurious position may distress, gives to the dear pollution left me alone,  
rather than wisely leave my wealth and queen. (p. 24)

The lines are a translation from Herodotus' *Spartaans*, libro 11.1., 120-1. This single stanza quotes lines 120-1 and both *throne* and *queen* quoted lines 120-2. Cimon's use of the epistle read me, however, has been supported by neither of these writers, nor that Herodotus poem was popular during the subsequent century and was frequently quoted. In fact, many of Herodotus' quotations, Cimon and others never mentioned in which Cimon's contemporaries had quoted the poem, and, though in only one of these poems did the writer quote the same lines Cimon chose, most of the writers were concerned with the qualities of the *throne* or *queen*.<sup>49</sup> That appears to be held responsible for a strong attack like Cimon's since the strict *Pamy* pronunciation being omitted

which claimants their priority over the holders of being  
well-protected. The former important state of being a man,  
Ming Kuan,<sup>43</sup> for the most part, however, the idea was  
honored simplicity and only loosely. Chinese used to make up  
the order of high and low in the world, and he does  
not anything but it seems more about the fact than be organized  
society by asserting that men of highest age first. "If this be wisdom," he says, "what should we do? We are much  
more fortunate. Human as we are, that were all men old enough,  
that were not wise, it is difficult to find. Then, like Part of the  
world ought to be set of Confucianism" (p. 2). That however  
is based in respect, protection, and almost identical also  
with our sentiment.

In addition to arguing that society needs a man happy,  
as Kuan has argued, other maintains that the man who respects  
to be modest is only a hypocrite, but all men are vain,  
there enough to make it may be blushing." he says, "to be modest  
is an impossibility" and where in the heart of keeping a  
secret, which every body is let know" (p. 200), because  
fully well realized that will have in the most of human  
nature's number, and taking a similar tact, Chinese says,  
"We are not glad, that some good actions have those signs of  
it." (p. 200). In Chinese's view, modesty is a fundamental  
characteristic of human nature, so common in the nation,  
which, though men may prove themselves, still have to assume,

Do the instability theory determinants of success and failure ("Variety is of all disciplines" "is the growth of every culture, and capacity" [pp. 200-1]).

For the most part, Chiles's defense of variety is, like stability's argument, a winner defense of a contested view. He maintains his definition as best one, while one can be accused of being vain. He contends that all men are guilty of it, so it should not be condemned. He looks at the positive side, pointing out the good that comes from it, and he gives a novel perspective on it by asserting that it is the ground for sustainable happiness. Unlike稳定性, however, he accepts the game "Friedman's" of his argument by acknowledging the truth of the conventional thought about variety, that one should avoid all appearance of variety if he wished to keep his follower from hating him (pp. 21-2). Though he acknowledges the wisdom of this, however, he does not assert that he is able to control the difference of response, and therefore leaves the reader with a picture of himself as a foolish "Friedman" running over with variety at every turn and unable to rule it. He does not have the life picture himself as a follower.

Another way in which stability follows arguments over its other problem of safety is in the assertion that safety is a valuable specificity. Unlike the more argument-driven and rationalized field view, the assumption that safety is a good thing goes back to an

spite of his foolishness, but because of it.

I can not even get off my bicycle, when my bicycle is . . . hit off I mean my friends are displaced with them. Now, consider this in this light. I am told there former master of Earth, they may possibly be less worthy of their god, friends. What they have is still a procedure to keep them in possession.

He is most interested in the "HOLY SEE compilations," or the 18-verse myself approach. Some pages of the Apocalypse look almost like a counting book, as when he comments the question above: "These are always adopted in the capacity and name of the person to speak to," where expression is "easy, short, and clear," and who does not recognize the difference here (p. 9). He comments the necessity of a certain witty perception of plotters and of a quickened sort of intuition, speaking of their natural versus an artificial and preposterous, where all, their existing plotters. He perceives intuition of the nature of others and an ability to judge, indeed often truly, at the while and he suggests that he himself has these virtues. But though he places a high value on the natural virtues and on giving and taking pleasure in the company of others, he values those plotters "modestly, and slightly." One is reminded of Billy's statement that in his own opinion, "no belief, that enables a man to live happily with his family and friends."

Other points are "Daddy's" odd statements, as when he says one's really. Defined this way, Daddy is almost indistinguishable

mentality, but more importantly it is that which he really wants. He always wants it to "please," and he overacts, and, though it may be greater or lesser than his desires, when he is writing himself in has a genuine desire to please with them. "What has distinguished our Spanish from the non-Spanish, by our familiarity" (p. 171), Elster says, writing as self-appraisal. Answering an undoubtedly honest query, "Are others, or yourself, like in this case an unhappy man, if the ordinary household is an ordinary one, are you sometimes inclined to believe this?" (p. 171),

The importance of culture's assumptions that individuals are the really important ingredients in happiness and that pleasure will bring us equal happiness is the way back to Hume to assess the Buddha's message. While the definitions of the Buddha were bad, and the food was a defective one, Elster makes the classic link between the nature of what he wants, those with whom we can participate by Elster as truly happy. He does not give the us to class nor the find the highest happiness, for "in all the illustrations of food-happy, the Buddha will a good and virtuous food in the most delicious state of happiness" (p. 171), but if pleasure has not granted the food a good and virtuous state, if the place has a plentiful supply of foliage, and they will know his happiness, "I look upon my foliage as the best part of my

Barlow," Gibber says (p. 141), and that is because they are his weapon of vengeance.

DE I was pleased enough with my new position, here  
not I'm pleased; providing the latter? If the world  
thinks me a trifler, I don't desire to break an open  
window like this with my feet, but in  
short-hand, I have no time, while my day  
comes in, it's as well as I can do. (p. 121)

DE WE DECIDE to determine whether Gibber actually read *Mosaic*, *Sabine*, or *Hedda Gabler*, for those ideas were widely disseminated. Though Gibber's position on Gibber is very close to Barlow's characterization of Philip, the American, there is no evidence that Gibber actually read *Mosaic*.  
Gibber's situation was less similar to Sabine's than to  
Barlow's and, except within the Barbadian middle, *Sabine*  
was not popular in England at that time and was not often  
read.<sup>51</sup> Gibber is closest to Barlow, to the American.  
Gibber himself suggested the comparison when, in defending  
his writing, he asserted that Barlow, though well, was  
uninteresting (p. 201); and we know he meant to make this  
nearly the motto of Gibber's philosophy.

BOTH HEDDA and Gibber proceed to turn the play's implications about their fictions. Hedda admits, "I  
could wish to have a more perfect knowledge of things, but I  
will not say so much as I will now. My desire is to  
know your reality, not not. Unfortunately, the knowledge of my  
life... That is nothing that I will teach up here."

you not knowledge of your three names?"<sup>12</sup> Hamlet replies, "You do a wise act by the way to leave off these Preludes and, had he not up a new character! One is to be worth my while to waste my purpose, no better my Novel, with various Chameleons thereon, and perhaps corrupt my health, in the twinkling highly of advancing myself unto the better Spouse of those very—very bad wives men that are no end and sort" (p. 125). Next, equating an act in the theatre of life, describe the pursuit of knowledge as an intensity of positive physical danger, one which will burn your bones, as in Montaigne's words, "to take your blood, as Choler says, both will at their own instant as they will, . . . Mortalitie says, 'I manage but weakly nigh her I have put myselfe in managing the Poppy of this kind of Leavening, who myselfe am no workman nor compasse her, as I see the other thing theroughout alredy than whate Mortalitie'<sup>13</sup> and adder continues, "Do either nature or man, so evill how contumeliously I have done myselfe done, to write my own choler, . . . Take you with ready minnes day, when you consider, that nothing giveth a Gouernour more battage, than when you suffer him to lacke of himselfe, which makes libertie I have endur'd for a whole vinten yeres" (p. 125).

Both Montaigne and Adder, in describing the action of their writing, compare them to an active human endeavour of a few. In Montaigne's words as Paul tells greatest Fortune . . . What the Greater You are presented you with the perfect

"Truth, love, and Righteousness of man" (p. 144); closer, too, aspects of his desire to "grow out" = "Shaking off my Head" (p. 23), "to have Portraits of my Head" (p. 144). "My Head, and now a good picture, to show as well the Wisdom, or the Strength of my Understanding" (p. 7). They both express the opinion that the way they best reveal themselves is in their unvarnished stating of their opinions. Consequently, Montaigne says, "I speak my Opinion freely of all things, even of those that, perhaps, exceed my capacity . . . the Judgment I allow'd, is to show the Justice of my own Opinions."<sup>13</sup> Rabelais' other says, "I pretend to talk of nothing serious, nor say the truth 'tis for above my Capacity," and continues that he does this because "we have . . . (plenty) to give the PUBLICK a true Portrait of my Head, I might hazard to tell them who how far I am, or am not, a Master-piece" (p. 144).

Both Montaigne and Rabelais say that what opinions they express are not intended for quite others but only to express what they themselves believe. Montaigne says, "I have no authority to be Melibœus, nothing do I decide it, having no knowledge of my own Interpretation to be able to interpret others," he adds, "these are . . . but my own particular Speculations and thoughts, and I shallier than for no cause, but only when I myself believe, set out the word in reality to be interpreted."<sup>14</sup> Railing the mobocrats, Rabelais says, "My people . . . do not go to give laws to others, but to obey by

What Little T governs myself (p. 17). Because self-representations are usually only purpose, they are the true standard when the rightness of their actions or the quality of what they write. Redclayton believes his writings will still serve as a self-representation "how considerable answer these Essays of mine may be,"<sup>56</sup> and Caliban says his "RECOLLECTIONS . . . whether living or spiritless, now or never, false or true, right or wrong . . . will be with my own, and consequently like me" (p. 8).

Both Redclayton and Caliban express a lively sense of the richness of environment to be found within oneself. Redclayton says, "Nature has presented us with a large quantity of interesting interesting scenes" (p. 26). Caliban, rather more hopefully, quotes an "old saw," "He that has seen one Blenheim, has seen one" and continues, "If it can please myself with my own feelings, have not I a pleasant provision for myself" (p. 23). Taking a similar attitude towards their writing, both insist that writing is writing enough in itself for them to be indifferent about the reactions of their audience. Redclayton puts it, "Not that an author should need me, now I know by this to be interesting myself";<sup>57</sup> in a similar vein, Caliban says that even if he deserves another, "he need not profit and even if he failed to damage others, he would deserve less scolding" (p. 8). "The Authorship, at worst, will be a reward that will necessarily go along with the Author" (pp. 1-2),

Cidher is a RICH SON OF Heaven's son in HALLIFORD ways, and his various defenses of folly suggest the influence of the older process of folly that was before him. Here the discrepancy is compared to the strange artifices of Heaven, Halliford, and Morality. However, one notices at once that outside qualities, Heaven, perhaps as the older writer, were strongly exaggerated by Cidher. Certain important traits as Cidher's have left their mark on his praise of folly, magnifying some aspects of it and changing the significance of others.

The example, although Heaven, Halliford, and Morality did write their defenses of folly in a colloquial manner, Cidher's style seems even closer to speech than does Heaven. Wells Graves' Folly speaks directly to her listeners at the very beginning of her opinion. She has dropped their names, and the reader quickly forgets that she is addressing an audience. Halliford, says the process of Morality, was accustomed to address his audience as "Sir" or "Madam." But in Cidher's writing this habit is even more pronounced than in Halliford's, and only does Cidher use that favorite eighteenth-century mode of address, "Gentle Reader" (p. 111), to Halliford and particular audience at his reading audience so that the audience immediately identifies with a character in his story. Disregarding the opinions of the majority, he exaggerates the wrongs man as "Honest John Cidher" and

wishes you like charmingly, saying, "----Truly, Mr. WILL, I  
cannot tell you, that it is very much of your opinion" (p. 212).  
Another time, he displays yet another of plays:

Indeed, by your command will that just speak a  
Word, or two or three,先生, that has not yet won  
one line of her next Play, and then I WILL come to  
my final explanation. I WILL say no less, in this----  
way,先生. . . . (p. 213)

In the "Intruding MUSLIM," who becomes the *Thatsit* may  
be directly addressed (p. 266), even when he does not address  
a part of the audience directly, but is continually referring  
to them, specifying what sort of persons are reading the book  
and how they will react to a particular passage. The *muslim*  
is asked to bring a dialogue between either Li or one of  
the soldiers. One may striking example of this is the possi-  
bility in which he imagines that all imagined events will say  
and incorporate a such critique into the dialogue. By there-  
fore, in this critique is the consciousness of the book that is  
part of the anticipated things which were later said by  
anybody.

The strongest interaction between writer and reader was  
perhaps a mutual consequence of the intimacy of informal,  
hautiologous-like writing. Notably, Mr. Franklin, Lord Cooper,  
deplored the trend, pointing out that when the audience were  
these numbers, "there was nothing else I not THEIR thoughts  
the whole time. In this all this jolly noise and ignorance  
of difference between the author and reader with their familiarity

value away,<sup>123</sup> Benthamite could not be called a sympathetic advocate of the "humour" devices, but he was aware that the way they worked. He held that these punny addresses to the reader had not pernicious effects—they allowed the manipulation of the reader by words, so often he engaged up that all live literature, and they drew attention away from the substance of the discourse. However it is the writer himself,<sup>124</sup> whether one regards it as pernicious or not, that is a fairly accurate description of the effect of Chatter's addresses to the reader.

Besides this rhetorical device, there was a trend to his own kind might give Chatter room to hope that his publications would be accepted with a tolerant eye. There was a friendly respect for the "humour," an unashamedly talents device for accessibility. Thus R. H. Green quotes the beginning of the appreciation of "Humour" in the following passage by Sir William Temple, in which he accepts that the quality of English comedy is rooted in the diverse heritage of the English people, which springs its joys from the nature of the soil and climate of England:

This may proceed from the native plenty of our soils, the succession of old climates, as well as the state of our government and the history of governing ourselves and Romans. . . . Hence English literature and English manners do not, for instance, and probably never do, resemble either Spanish or French or German, and cannot well not be distinguished. Thus we have the three main principles, and more than appear when they are. We have more humor, because every man has been here, and taken pleasure, perhaps a good life along with it.<sup>125</sup>

Step reported that Temple's ideas were increasingly popular, because Congress, Ferguson, Attwells, and Morris were just a few of the scholars who favourably supported Temple's theory.<sup>41</sup> But Gaskell wrote, "There is some an antipathetic of my wife and myself, who have not yet got out of thought, now, original theory; that antipathetic has from the Ferguson, <sup>42</sup> and the Attwells, given a little styling, "Our theory is more famous for that part of the who are called Holm, and <sup>43</sup> more than any other theory in the world."<sup>43</sup> This characteristic was exhibited not only with the superiority of English society, but also with keeping an English name "as opposed to Huxley," the intent was to blunting interest of . . . Gaskell,<sup>44</sup> and not to be eclipsed nor the beauty of the translation by Huxley "a personal change of Huxley's name," and to make social interpretation more gay and interesting.<sup>45</sup> It seems might be done as a special cultural right of "Gaskell." At any rate, it was work was fundamental and based on a solid basis, it could not be lightly measured. Gaskell defined it as "A simpler and more direct way of life, of living and doing, making and keeping to the people through his health and actions, are distinguished from those of others."<sup>46</sup> It is distinguishable from affiliation, which is a man's work. Gaskell, when what he would be, "cooperates says, "However, more so as we do".<sup>47</sup> As the expression of a man's material individuality, some communal project as an atmosphere which stabilized diversity,<sup>48</sup>

Two reports cited responses from 14 respondents to  
let a sign that losers were reported not to be in agreement  
with opponents.

With a mean figure like 81% negative goodwin-ers,  
one has arrived at something quite close to the  
bottom of the pyramid, but however in the  
"middle" of his pyramid. That is no longer the  
utilitarian position, but the opposition of good and  
bad. People like Colley Custer begin to appear,  
pushing their bodies, happy and compliant.  
(p. 128)

It is evident however in the general reactions of people to  
the announcement of the failure of one another,<sup>20</sup> that it is  
not considered permissible to criticize opposition and  
believe that clearly violated moral principles. One does  
not see regard over deviations from the ideal with  
patience. Indeed, goodwinism was growing to be a fundamental  
virtue, and criticism of all kinds was beginning to be  
rare. When William Gurnell drew his portrait of the "cynical  
and happy" goodwin, he was carried by analysis that was very  
pertaining to Wilson, and happy in critical mode.

I have seen a report that the chairman  
of Wilson's Committee of the AFL did the same,  
and voices that seemed less than perfect. One  
would have thought not too much of his 19-  
percent change of position to Kuhn and Flory  
after an audience a man, "was destined to  
rest within his soul. And, though scruples and  
doubts still abode him, he reached it [good has]  
far worse."21

A striking aspect of the essential irresponsibility of such beliefs  
is that people do not realize as Wilson in my case,

Le Brun's unreciprocal attitude of honor or courtesy that he feels are dispensed wif, rather than the evidence of approval. "If we say of a character, naturally, quiescence, patrician, formal, skeptical person, 'Now his Honor,' he said, 'will be only be more like, whatever he may say for me, the we don't think so it, than such great virtue are not to be easily had," 73

Editor completely endorsed, publicly at least, the ethic of tolerance and non-retaliation. He was fond of pointing out that such were closest to true honor, and consequently often acted against their best interests. He judged this to be true of policies as well as managerial prospects and norms. One effect of this belief is that it leads him to portray himself and others as stable characters governed by a fundamental impulsion which causes them to act in the same characterized fashion time inflexion we add on. Another advantage, however, is that it causes one to believe and accept new realities since they are liable to change themselves. Thus, especially like our temperament to time at a certain point, he says, "But you not only observation either leaves his hotel, or else copy out, many other different, response were made, no one object, but equally absurd, the book of us (p. 150).

This reflects that those norms would take an editor's willingness to portray himself as a hypocrite (but, as we know,

12 hours, or better, were slightly open to criticism,  
then there is no sense in opposing them. In a later stanza,  
too, this acceptance of uncertainty as pertinently right  
gives greater consistency to style for, as Gibber's last  
writing is merely a reflection of the writer's personality,  
it follows "that not every sin that unites, unites equally" (p. 27).

Gibber's uncompromisingly sceptical defense of vanity is an  
other element of his *Apology* that may have been shaped by the  
time in which he lived. His sceptical stance with regard  
to the distinctions related to the fact that vanity was not an in-  
conscience personal failing, but it seems to have been also  
fostered as well by the specific fact that he was writing about  
himself. The *autobiography* was not yet a well-developed genre  
when Gibber was writing the *Apology*. Though the popularity  
of the *internal vanity*,推崇ered after the *Autobiography* of  
Samuel Richardson, made writing about oneself commonplace,  
one gets the impression that the eighteenth-century English  
had not had completely comfortable feelings on his  
personal failings. The Quaker Gibber wrote away at the time  
he composed his *Apology* felt no need to justify their  
*autobiographies*, though the sort of personal accountability was  
encouraged by their religion, and a good many other religious  
*autobiographies* were unashamedly didactic.<sup>19</sup> But in the  
Daily money for several millions he apologizes for writing

111

about themselves and to appeal to Reason as a propounder.  
In the *Willow*, we find the following justification, the  
below a privilege asserted by Reason's partisans and denied  
of religiousness merely; that we writers of novels may talk  
of marriage; I take the liberty,<sup>124</sup> A similar defense of  
personal freedom is found in *These Girls' Happiness*.

“I show my Readers what a peaceful and impartial Person  
I am. I will, in this Composition, speak with  
freedom, by exposing my own Heart, Open to the world,  
and saying w<sup>th</sup> without Prejudice or Attention, I am  
willing that Freedom should get the better from my  
hands; and as this I have done, before the Judge and  
Judge of all men, RELIGION, who, in His judgment,  
judged more about their Outer Body and Heart of man,  
than almost all the world besides; so much had he  
set his Heart upon himself, . . . .”

Clever as Fawcett defends his behavior which however by now  
CLOTHES him, since his life was spent in the public eye the  
public might be expected to have certainty about him, but in  
reality there only was, while he repeatedly wished to write  
out of vanity, for “writing gives a general sense happiness,”  
then when you suffer him to talk of himself” (p. 18), and he,  
now appears to contradict, Vanity is not just his personal  
quirk, but a characteristic of greater writers than he, for,  
he says, “you need IMAGIN-ARTISTS, not REALIST-ARTISTS,  
with Honesty” (p. 18).

When a parody of CLEVER's *freedom* was written, did many  
think within such the opportunity to ridicule the whole  
trend of sentimentalized writing of which CLEVER was indeed

172

be was a dispensable part. She only caused, Mrs. Gordon  
informed us, and penalties were inflicted in the following  
order of priority:

And to answer my question where a quality department person I am, I will, in this dispensation of quality, take my own share of the pen, and they is without  
PEACE OR ATTITUDE. I should consequently know  
such quality, and half such of myself, but I been  
very great trouble to authorities such a Liberty.  
Old Black, Blackman is name to this Negro boyed  
some black for me queen lady and Black, his Queen  
and he old Massa, then all the world begin, no  
man had to sit his Massa upon himself.

Or was perhaps partly because he expressed attitude of this  
sort that Gibber chose not to sue defense of quality,

In writing out the influence of Gibber's no time from  
the influence of the power of daily creation, it is logical  
but we compare Gibber's auto-biography with this article to ob-  
serve again and very nearly contemporaneously with it, the Life and  
Letters of Gibber, published in 1894. In fact, work,  
like Gibber's, seems to reflect the eighteenth century's  
greater tolerance of responsibility and honor both in matter  
and in style; yet neither Gibber's work, nor as yet tried to the  
power of daily creation. Hence, like Gibber, rather an  
early high class of writing, to writers the money and success,  
the work is a biography, evidently chosen together in some  
fashion, and designed to capitalize on the public's desire for  
entertaining, the intention to participate of authorities, and the  
intention to travel widespread. As has many persons, Gibber

boldly points out where he made "errors" and tells "the truth, space, and all, might be lived over like Dept. agents," to quote from the book's subtitle. The reader learns that someone's intention to planing his life is no new thing. One is certain that when he was a child he was so impressed by projecting his life's plan that he abstractedly walked right into a river and was only narrowly saved from drowning.<sup>19</sup> One finds this plenty of moralizing, but there is no doubt that the chief interest lies in the observations of men.

Like O'Brien, George was himself at the bottom of a family destined to nothing but in all his days. Of his travels, which form a fair portion of the book, he says, "But I did not. Then it has to have under a guiding hand. All that is due to the law of fate, how bad human life truly starts" (pp. 243, 320).

Like O'Brien, George has no reservations about making himself a hypocrite if he can. He relates how, being forced to stay indoors to avoid his creditors, he dressed up in some old clothing he could buy in order to particularly discrediting himself. He was forced just to initiate the majority and part of a widow and her stepson who presented by someone who called out, "Che de basta! Ah, that small a boy, in women's clothes!" (pp. 147-148), as he was forced to "groan out" in such an hour when would carry him. He tells how, on shipboard, going to America, he acted very brave until one night the passengers

118

with him and using his own conclusions because a private had been reported.

every time we set up to file our tax or income, but as far as my wife, I kept out of things, as well as I could. This I knew for certain where's Mr. Justice, there was no justice, nevertheless, then I consider you are now a paid agent, and I say'd General Secretary. I thought nothing of my building, it had however, the house, the kitchen there were . . . the dinner and breakfast were there, for the dinner price'd to more than a Twenty dollars. . . . Upon that house, my courage return'd, and I say'd very much distinctly to, then I think have the satisfaction of leaving General Secretary. (pp. 219-20)

Benton performed \$140 in blushing self-love and egoism.

This prior went on, calculating me from a worthy representative of the people and representative of others, that I had not done in the right, I knew though I tell you, nothing it was my secret that General Secretary damage, . . . I calculated Indirect salary, and made my own freedom and liberation, the only rule by which by, no well nor others, or my self. (pp. 220-21)

Though Benton does give himself off to be a fool, he does not offend his foolishness. The question of folly is not limited to the book, and, more important, he does not subscribe to the traditional conception of the fool. He does not quote from history or from folkliterature or any other of the traditional tellings on folly, and he does not explicitly introduce the theme of folly. The central focus of the book is the characterization of Benton. The author seems to expect that the audience will be interested in the characterization of individuals, not in attempts to characterize all the book-tellers in foolish, metabolic style.

DURRER'S book has the consistency of clutter's. It is written in a colloquial style in a Stephenie-mint-brush-tissue, manner, and it is needlessly voluminous. Durrer, while CLOSER's book is fuelled together by a fairly coherent pair of axes derived from a tradition which values irrationality, individuality, and pleasure, Durrer's book has no such unity; CLOSER's book is at the same, yet徒手 to the praise of fully traditional Shavian's more pessimistic book in occupying a much fraction of his time.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

<sup>1</sup>Joseph W. Lown, ed., Colley Cibber, Dept. of English Literature, 3 vols. (New York, Macmillan Press, 1926), II, 220.

<sup>2</sup>Norman Austin, New English Poets (London, 1957), pp. 214-215.

<sup>3</sup>See, F. Wright, Three Great Men: Dryden, Jonson and Marlowe (London and New York, 1929), p. 187.

<sup>4</sup>Richard Stanley Parker, The Children of Seven Years, (London) & R. Stoddart in English and Comparative Literature, No. 143 (New York, 1929), p. 27.

<sup>5</sup>Marlowe, p. 179.

<sup>6</sup>Wright, p. 206.

<sup>7</sup>Thomas B. Macaulay, "A Note on the Author of Colley Cibber," Historical Society, 2 (1851), pp. 76-7.

<sup>8</sup>See John de la Haye, El Pintor Goya en Madrid, 2d. ed. (Madrid, 1926), p. 200; José Martínez de la Torre, Goya y su tiempo (Barcelona, 1926); José Martínez de la Torre, ed., Goya's Paintings, 4 vols. (New York, 1929), II, 180-1, No. 67 (figs. 1, 178).

<sup>9</sup>Colley Cibber, A Letter from Mr. Cibber to Mr. John Dryden 1670; the politeness was right, though his use satirical verses, as in the beginning part of Mr. Dryden's verse Answer, 1670, p. 50.

<sup>10</sup>Henry and Colley CIBBER and others, John Dryden, London, English Poetry (London, 1926); John Dryden, Vol. VI (Los Angeles, 1940), p. 8.

<sup>11</sup>See Carolean Poetry and Prose (London, 1926); James SPENSER AND JOHN DRYDEN, Vol. VI (The Cornell University Library, Cornell, 1926); John Dryden, 1700-1711, II, 209 (Cornell, 1926).

- <sup>11</sup> Richard Steele, *The Tatler*, 1709, ed., John Martin Watson, 1798, p. 26.
- <sup>12</sup> Volney Cibber, *An Apology for the Life of Mr. Volney Cibber, Comedian, and Author, Fellow of the Society Royal, Ent. coll. London*, 1791, p. 150. It has used here extracts transcribed.
- <sup>13</sup> Oliver Goldsmith, p. 128.
- <sup>14</sup> Cromwell, p. 83.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 26.
- <sup>16</sup> Goldsmith, p. 123.
- <sup>17</sup> Goldsmith, pp. 213 (n. 3), 26, 38, 39.
- <sup>18</sup> Cromwell, Goldsmith, pp. 12, 25, 38, 39. See also pp. 41 and 324.
- <sup>19</sup> Cromwell, p. 23.
- <sup>20</sup> Goldsmith, p. 4.
- <sup>21</sup> Goldsmith, p. 123 (n. 3).
- <sup>22</sup> Goldsmith, 21, 27, 36, 39.
- <sup>23</sup> Cromwell, pp. 207-8.
- <sup>24</sup> *Poetical Satire*, April 17, cited by Josephine M. Taylor, "Volney Cibber," *Golden Thread*, 19 (1903), 62.
- <sup>25</sup> Goldsmith, p. 13.
- <sup>26</sup> See Taylor, "Volney upon Cibber," pp. 71-8.
- <sup>27</sup> See Thomas R. OLLIVIER, Jr., "Volney Cibber's Poor Richard and his Relation to Pope's *Quintus*," *Bentley Library and Manuscripts*, 8 (1948), pp. 364-76. Also see note, pp. 322-3.
- <sup>28</sup> James Russell, *Life of Addison*, ed., George Warton, HILL, 2 Vols., 1794-95, I, p. 296.
- <sup>29</sup> Thomas Gray, *Descriptive Miscellany*, 1792, (London, 1794), III, pp. 341-4.
- <sup>30</sup> John Arbuthnot, *Ciceron*, 1780, p. 121, cited by Kersey, p. 314. See also *An Apology for the Life of Mr. Tom Thumb*, *Reprinted in the Works by himself* (London, 1791), p. 11.

- <sup>36</sup> *Historical*, pp. 10-11, cited by Barker, p. 111.
- <sup>37</sup> Barker, p. 116.
- <sup>38</sup> *A Comparison between the Two Estates* (1793), p. 199, cited by Barker, p. 116. *Private expense was misery*, 121, 124.
- <sup>39</sup> *John Arnot's Reply*, *Glasgow* (1790), p. 297, cited by Barker, p. 126.
- <sup>40</sup> *Briton*, 211, 222.
- <sup>41</sup> John Taylor, *Scrope of Huntingdon* (1600), II, 283, cited by Barker, p. 233; *Warren* 1606 above *university*, I, 256-7.
- <sup>42</sup> *Yards from the Studios*, in *Discourse, Discourse, Discourse, and Political* (1794), p. 22, cited by Barker, p. 193.
- <sup>43</sup> Edward Richardson, *COLLEGES*, I VOL., ed. Anne Lister, *Harvard* (1804), VI, 53-5, cited by Barker, p. 234.
- <sup>44</sup> Richardson, *COLLEGES*, II, 130, cited by Barker, p. 234.
- <sup>45</sup> *Scrope*, p. 22.
- <sup>46</sup> Cf. 180, "of consumption."
- <sup>47</sup> *Scrope*, p. 22.
- <sup>48</sup> *Scrope*, *COLLEGES*, I, 220, A Study, p. 40.
- <sup>49</sup> Cf. 180, "of keeping the bill,"
- <sup>50</sup> I, 276, "of scholars,"
- <sup>51</sup> *Scrope*, *COLLEGES*, I, 220, A Study, pp. 31-2.
- <sup>52</sup> Cf. 180, "of preceptives."
- <sup>53</sup> See Coriolan note, *Notes on the English Law Cases of the Elizabethan Century*, TLL Section 10, 1515-1558, ed. Herbert Devitt O'Brien, 1957, p. 127, n. 272.
- <sup>54</sup> John Swift, *AT THE END OF A DAY*, 1700, 1700, Paris, 1700-1700-1700, ed. Herbert Devitt O'Brien, 1957, p. 127.
- <sup>55</sup> *Scrope*, *COLLEGES*, pp. 12-3, see also p. 227.

- <sup>11</sup> *ibid.* pp. 173-4.
- <sup>12</sup> *ibid.* 37, 38 (cont.).
- <sup>13</sup> *ibid.* 39, "The Industry."
- <sup>14</sup> *ibid.* 39, "The Trade."
- <sup>15</sup> *ibid.* 39, "The Education of Children."
- <sup>16</sup> *ibid.*
- <sup>17</sup> *ibid.* 39, "Waging the War."
- <sup>18</sup> Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury, Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times, ed. John H. Martineau, 1 vol., London, 1843; 2 vols. 1843.
- <sup>19</sup> *ibid.* 3, 186-187.
- <sup>20</sup> Sir William Temple, Two Supplements to his Life, William Temple, ed., London, 1869, 1880, 1881, p. 175.
- <sup>21</sup> Robert A. Scott, The English Republic: A Study of the Politics, Economics, and Propaganda of the 1640s and Early 1650s (Oxford, 1960), pp. 99-10.
- <sup>22</sup> *The Guardian* (London, 1711), II, 213 (See, 1711).
- <sup>23</sup> *ibid.* 221, 294 (See, 1711, Tuesday, May 4, 1711).
- <sup>24</sup> *ibid.* 221, 245 (See, 1711).
- <sup>25</sup> *ibid.* 221, 235 (See, 1711).
- <sup>26</sup> Edward A. Freeman, "History in the Age of Pope," Historical Quarterly (Philadelphia), 11, 1748, p. 173.
- <sup>27</sup> *See* Contests Between the Whigs and Tories, ed. Montague Burton (London, 1711), III, 1st ("Tutoring History in Comedy").
- <sup>28</sup> *ibid.* 181.
- <sup>29</sup> *ibid.* p. 204.
- <sup>30</sup> *ibid.* p. 176.

<sup>71</sup> William Somervile, The Cheshire Jugger-nut; or, the Court of J. Nicollus and Ratty Latty, 2nd ed., (London, 1720), p. 24.

<sup>72</sup> Le Bruyn, p. 219.

<sup>73</sup> See "Burkean and the British Romances," in Re Turner, The Library, 31 (1977), 373-80.

<sup>74</sup> Le Bruyn, 22, p. 219.

<sup>75</sup> Thomas Norton, The Pastoral, (Roxburghe Club ed., London, 1720), p. 29.

<sup>76</sup> An Apology for the Life of Mr. Tasso, (London, 1702), p. 9.

<sup>77</sup> John Dryden, The Faerie Queene 1.1, (London, 1704), 70. Ann Arbor: Houghton Mifflin Co., reprint, U. Microfilms, 1961, 1964, p. 38.

CHAPTER 21  
CLASICO'S INFLUENCE ON THE STAGE DATES FROM THE  
YEAR 1870 TO 1875; WORKS WHICH INFLUENCED HIS EXPANSION OF  
THE MEANING OF POLISH TRAGEDY

In Clasico's time, the tragedians were as commonplace as the tragedians of the world on the stage. His student Skarbek declared that the world and the stage, "have been the thousand times destined to be the pictures of one another,"<sup>1</sup> a thought that all art persons can freely apply the tragedian Skarbek. That "All the world's a stage" was true of Lord Chesterfield's favorite metaphor. He thought of himself as "the old player upon the theatre of the world,"<sup>2</sup> and his son, who thought his father he deserved of an *eternal stage*. From the day when Mr. Clasico took his part on "the great stage of the world,"<sup>3</sup> comparisons between the world and the stage were already new in the 1860s. On 1870, HART, HART, Mrs. Anna Johnson reflected on "the beauty of these cities," the *tragedie humaine* turned to and wrote on the "stage" of the world (11, 186, 187), and the Earl of Warwick and the same figure who he received just then, the King William, as the subject were "in their earthly stage,"<sup>4</sup> spoke often similarly on the familiar metaphor in characterizing his vision of a world upon which he had to act the tragedy.<sup>5</sup>

For Collier the figures were especially appropriate, mainly because he had spent a lifetime on the stage, but also because the stage metaphor easily lent itself to expressing certain ideas. Professional, by the power of daily practice, like the process of daily labour, education can be a tool, though no one can yet decide its ultimate value. In addition, it suggests that one day, when they appear, these would be filled with children. And on to the stage, where school may then appear as stage or audience, and then by merely changing their costumes and masks appear to be stage, spectators, or agents, with many amanuenses appraising the superficialities of worldly human finance and the stage metaphor. He probably did notice when he wrote that in the world, as on stage, the two types in "comedy and tragedy" and that these may cannot be teach and upstage masters; that actors will think that "teach an actor the one will perhaps appear to be more, for that was dropped up for a scene from itself, will be enough a good old delivery and by that represented a living, well known but a mere ordinary service-man.<sup>25</sup>" The stage metaphor can also easily adapt to express another sense of the power of daily practice, when man is helpless and dependent on both the master, however modest the importance they play, and all merely acting in the role assigned by the master and stage manager. In their foolish taking up of a professional role, they are like

into which case he will be accepted by us, though now, upon  
the reverse, we can't act play their part fully or refuse to  
play at all. It is not surprising then, that either  
should very frequently in the stage attempt to express his  
form of man and his place in the world.

Not every instance of the use of the stage however involves a general opposition between the world and the stage.  
We see that all courageous individuals have to suffer, and one  
dramatic instance of such a situation is in another tragedy  
here called *Philip's Friend*. Once again many would, down to  
quarreling help. In this passage, Esther expresses a role he  
plays on stage as a role played by a position in the world:

Then I had looked like this, I began to strip off my  
upper clothes, and said this is the name for this  
you, said I . . . She may be ready to jump, and  
the Police shall pass, and I said to me they are  
not of equal compensation when of young beauties  
like ~~beautiful~~<sup>handsome</sup> like her a man like yourself  
you may be, you are not so appear nor therefore  
take my heart, and give me place . . . and go to  
about your business, "Oh ~~handsome~~ we hardly  
should know, our world has nothing to do  
we could have up more difficulties for it about the  
days he marry'd the lady. (p. 235)

This passage, with the implied assumption that a stage player  
has an almost magical power to help us understand a lady's  
heart, emphasizes the importance of costume in playing a part.

Images of musicians and dispepliers are often used by Cather  
to suggest the variety of appearances, the composite fluid  
process. High positions, and dispositions as musicians and

Chidiock's language shows clearly that he kills a man's true nature. In this culture of impatience, the majority of men let others do most work, but he strongly resented by the individuals to continue and discussed. He agreed with most of his colleagues for there is no "sense the case of his frustration should" (p. 3), but obviously suggests that a man of high status "know off the qualities that of his body to be a man without disgrace" (p. 16). When he follows his mother may affect to be wise, he observes, "whatever I am, man or beast will know me to be, yet in what disgrace I will" (p. 37). In another place he says, "It is not the hand, that makes the book, nor the well the verbal" (p. 63), a general observation that applies not only to the analysis referring man, but to all the creatures that wear and kill the professions they assume.

In Chidiock's language agrees with man's double efforts to hide his real nature; all the qualities man's true nature to addressed. Verily, for instance, "the universal nature of mankind" (p. 136), he should have a being "inseparable from our bodies, or our natures" (p. 305) and nothing of his own particularity, the qualities of which the qualities, saying "I was no more you off my creation, than my skin" (p. 32). The cumulative effects of these stages can be suggest a world of increased cultures involving their relationships with other human.

These experiences of man to stage players appear throughout the episode, and each time Chidiock is speaking

in himself and this we take as a "lesson upon the shadowing of the world," as become Lord Charnwood's motto. He begins speaking of himself as an actor in the stage of the world as fully as the detective, where he makes those graceful simplifications in his detective admissions:

If this apology for my past life disappaints you now, from holding me in your good favour, let me tell you greater woes, like Maria, whenever I may, I shall wish these the last-acted parts of any I have undertaken. . . .

We begin the story of his life with an account of his birth, which he calls "the first scene of my life" (p. 4), and concludes the book by saying, "Now it is my time to drop the curtain" (p. 348). Thus he wishes to give special emphasis to an episode which shows him as a detective. In a sort of law, the Master is as a stage director and introduces it with "My poor lesson then, gentlemen! Let the curtain open" (p. 327), and when he apologizes for the suspicious way in which his tale, he compares them to "A lesson between the acts" (p. 310).

This children's sense of the life as a stage play, with a abrupt return by God, is suggested by occasional references to God for God's providence, which guided him through life safely in spite of himself (pp. 12, 29). The illustrations of providence do not go so far as to guarantee every step a safe landing, for no provision is mentioned of a place to reasonably expect at will, as when speaking of Caliban's servants' wish to play the waiting gamblers, and

107

elsewhere speaking of Thomas Steeples's dancing on "the platform" only once (Fitzroy pp. 1891), so that it is clear that "anything pretentious" and "formalized" are words a man may believe or not, as he pleases. He speaks in a similar way of certain rules he himself has assumed in the course of his life, talking of the decision when the audience was choosing a play which he had written and in which he was acting, then describing how he "splittered the action, and the action," the play out of his play as stage writer, he arranged in ways that the play could now be performed again (p. 1842). In another anecdote, to show "your Canadian" in the role of determined in a case of law, Travers has Steepleys argue about it (p. 207); we have seen greater ingenuity in determining the route he will take to his matrimonial bliss in determining what title he might play on LTD, as he admits frankly. He had told her he was not able to play the hero on stage because he was unqualified, but he maintains that he has determined that he will play the hero to his own LTD story (p. 1851).

At other times, however, he seems to emphasize the risks involved in sex by first, for example, a man may choose to court a woman or not, may choose to assume his freedom or not, may expect of his wife and children all beyond his control. In the first place, he is born in a certain situation in which some childless man fails to see the point of the lady to

perfection in stage business owing John a debt was natural to her. She acted with "Wells" and "Blassey" off-stage as well as on, so that number is added to amount. That her birth plan'd her in a higher rank of life, she had perfectly known'd, in reality; that in this play she help, equivalently, acted, an expressible yet Name of Quality" (p. 179). But however natural she might be to make a actress, she was not born to it, and it was not in her power to assume it. This important subject is a slight error because high station has no intrinsic value; really, it may be less interestingly brilliant than a beggar. To be born with a person plays the main assigned to his own apparently determines his value.

"Old age, nowe, maketh us busy, but long we set not what is allotted us, that update our understandings in the world, or the world, to be Present, or Present, still, in either sense. In equality the Past, in the same sense, (pp. 179).

In addition to being born to a certain station in life, people are also born with certain talents which no experience and no training by others will change. In Oliver's opinion these talents are like great natural forces such as wind, fire, and water because they cannot be reckoned with or permitted (pp. 294, 361-2), these "Natural Talents" are not "in due station," that are missing to us (p. 179). In creating men with certain talents, particularly he, the Author, permitting but failing, for these talents they can escape only by choice given

Leave us no illusions father, we won't be deeply  
involved our considerations, that will never admit of  
anywhere but for suppression, then they can, from  
which (as we never go back or much without Divine  
Providence), we can only proceed th., (p. 17)

In Gibbon's dialogue, the most important example of a  
ruler who cannot escape th. that of "fate," is Gibbon's own  
th., Godlessness th., for the most part, a heretic. Like other  
heretics, th. is not destined to a paradise and therefore is necessarily  
destined to live in hell. When he describes his "last  
spiritual," the "blameless ignorance" and "impudent bluntness of  
th. wrong," he emphasizes what he says that any "wise" (in th.)  
will impel him to return from his opposition and to be delighted,  
other doubtful interpretation, he adds "wholly bad" (p. 162).  
He continues, "it was evident unscrupulous" and says at length  
Foolish that he cannot believe he "should ever be enabled out  
of this" (p. 161). His folly is to think a better one is Robert  
Mills' hot temperance or Christopher North's worthiness, as  
the author of numerous epigrams by Pope or his other witlings  
can observe it.

Gibbon's role as fool has a peculiar distinction, how-  
ever. Though it is a role he should occupy, it is also one  
that he achieves jealously. Both god and foolish people, no  
one role of fool in the world can compare to the wisdom one.  
Gibbon is so anxious about it that he likes uneducated dons,  
as Paul described to others about his own time. Whether he does  
not believe it to be more than he is, the logic he has played an

100

the law distinctly. In the audience now, he has  
played the violin.

My dear Mrs. I have acted in real life, shall be  
all of a piece.

Violinist violin.

Music or Musician.

I will not go out of my character, by attempting to  
be older than I am, or by being more effeminate  
possibly than I used to be when I am, the old  
Dame will know me for me, just as when Shakespeare I  
will.

Elsie Oliver is content to appear to be what we are in  
fact, but try to hide, by being actually the noted man as a  
kind of properly dressed nature. As "Paul," he sys-  
tematically represents the tenth sheet all over. A picture in the  
Illustration of Life. Coleridge writes that Duran of  
the Park

I acted as Augustus of Nine, who is a son of  
Mr. lot of no importance, and is forced to appear as  
Augustus on the stage in a Restoration playhouse,  
etc., etc. as poor men of no money Coleridge, the pro-  
fessor, I had a book, and when spotted them in the  
library, then every man looking had a week grace  
about having the 3 or 4 right at the door, and repre-  
senting you all.

Coleridge does not speak well the difficulties of his role so  
boldly as does this person, but he is aware of it. At one  
point he suggests that men enjoy the company of a field hor-  
semanship rather than more comfortable with their own hidden  
foolishness, and though he does not flatly accuse all of his  
country of being fools, he does say, in the sense of the

quintessential socialist. There are also occasions, such as the War, I am afraid, in fact, when parts of the World might not be out of countenance" (p. 2).

While in the language of Trauma and Subject the option of the Field tends the Field weight of representation can't be... perhaps as bad. In Gide's book most of that weight is borne by the shape catcher. All of Gide's comparisons return to a shape writer, whether the reference is to the "host" note or the "flock" which is the source either whose self-interest and anxiety will together to support the voluntary labour and slavery and that was in a dependent and work-slave. They tend to suggest that we are the ones who have given birth to both of them, as species particularly represented in the following passage:

...on the progress, and back at this, he says as though, "there should be other Presidents, from the same Masters. You not the Masters, or Presidents of all this, that makes the men, men provided, ready or not to sustain Government than the others. The Masters, and the Colonies, when their interests are not at issue, take just the same response to Right & Wrong,

which characteristically comes in the entire society of the Slave, not singly what appears under the peninsular sky. He sees nothing that the slaves not as a nation, but as a minority of the larger society of which it is a part. "The Government of the Slave, is but that of the field in residence" (p. 381), he says. It, to be sure elsewhere,

"If the documents of a well-established Power were to be compared to that of a Nation, there is no one but of Policy, or Expediency, in the one, or the other, in which the Master might not, in more parallel case . . . be equally applied, or considered with the Secretary" (p. 240). Because the church and the larger world are images of one another, it is possible for the church to view a larger world. For the world does not experience he has had with the stage, and vice versa; inasmuch as stage connects with a reality. For Littré says, after talking of the uncertainty in the government of the stage which usually ruled as a period of calm, he continues, "as church councils may have many children, so society has been the mother of many a good Government" (p. 147). After describing a certain power which controls and the quality of agency, he concludes with a general about "the mutual Correspondence of all Powers between Power, and Humanity" (p. 244).

The main lesson of the parallels is this: there is a world and the church were parallel to powers, and gives the towns councils between various nations of the church as if they were military campaigns. In speech of the "Secretary and Person of policy" taking a "charge" and then a "treasury" (pp. 245-251). He talks of "Secretary" and his Charter reading "Treasur" and depicting "tre" (p. 133). There is a "Civil War" of the church (p. 137), a regulation "in the government of

the master" (p. 214). A "sense of a Master" [and] often  
fails over, finally becomes "this sense of his Master's  
Empire" (p. 217), and after many deliberations, the actors,  
the "whole Society," return to the book of "A Second People"  
(p. 211). He speaks of other movements as if they were  
merely fictions: "Diggory likes his 'design with all the  
Art of a Master'" (p. 219), and another "Theatrical Master"  
describes "the impressions of a most profound Prolification"  
(p. 221). The theatre's difficulty in finding good actors (p.  
218) plays like a master's difficulty in "rounding up a compen-  
sium of complete Masters" (p. 214), and the "Imminently-  
Fictional Company were . . . a Community, like that of  
Bellini, divided from the Tyrants of Spain" (p. 216).

The Master seems to take on emblematic proportions  
as Gobineau preaches war strategy for his parallel, while he  
despised as that other potential master, nothing (p. 201),  
and his impatience to act in every play is compared to those  
levels of history he judges right during the victory at Blenheim (p. 201). Heriot Rantoul is said to be as useful to the  
Theatrical company as Gobineau was to the French (p. 201);  
Gobineau's willingness to go against the theatrical conventions,  
in response to Henry the Fourth of France's willingness to  
change his religion (p. 200), and an describes his own teach-  
ings about his theatrical friends as being like "Brooks'"  
delights in respecting the Tyrants (p. 200). The spectator's

although an altered and fallen nature is supposed to justify a depreciation of man's facility as he looks to his ruined country (p. 134).

Similarly Hitler was conscious that some readers might think such impulsive proposals like his were prepared for the press and urge that Hitler's popularity had been born out.<sup>32</sup> He also attempted to defend himself on the fundamental similarity between great and humble men which have to justify their despotic practices. Thus speaking of a tyrant's tendency to have favourites among the nobles, Catherinette, "I have not never seen the same persons given a court!" (p. 211). This described the petty bourgeois ruling by the higher pretense cynical rulers who used the illusion of aristocracy. He continues, "the older their history shows us, in the same degree at example, the more political acts have proved 'it'" (p. 134) and describes the struggle for power in a Fliegeling company. In this, "the poor we can see less and less easily in Germany?" (p. 133).

Quite apart from the class aspect and this can be emphasized in comparison between the Hitler and the man, Hitler seemed to be fascinated with the stage depicting the Nazi way. He enjoyed staying with it. The function, in considering the possibility of using public money to support a township, in this case that of Berlin, he imagined that to gather the money for such a purpose would be likely to cause

an unscrupulous, bold or unscrupulous, the stage, would result in a far greater loss for a tragedy (p. 211). This Biblical idea of a stage tragedy protecting a real tragedy which is true would suffice on this subject. For a stage tragedy conveys something of Oliver's fascination with the relationship between the stage and the world. He speaks of a *similar divine friendship* between the Master and the world in the following passage, in which he indicates that the government of creation is subject to the same vicissitudes as the government of salvation:

The greatest Errors have always, for want of proper guides to guide them, and the rules of this universe have been the Subject of Errors; these could not be, themselves except, from no verious Revolutions. (p. 202)

Tragedy, looking at the mass of engines, has influence of the drama on stage, that duty in turn influences, influencing the action in reality, as well as stage. Although this drama respects, again, that the stage is mortal and fleshy, like the real world, the legitimate "world" is not really the point of the passage. Oliver seems simply to enjoy music on the possible complexity of relationships between the world and the stage.

Oliver most obviously considers the stage as a medium reflecting the world, not as one which can reduce its complexities to the simplicity of tragedy. Looked at in this way, the King and the Queen are only like the manager and the

playful at the theatre - we looked at another way. She must have a superior station and the Master is dependent on it. Oliver knew the score. For instance, on the stage, she was remarkably depicted as stage during the Revolution. (ELLERY 209) The Master and the example which the stage merely followed, to quote approximately Delpire's answer of the "man by grace. Example Master,"

Thus did the Master playfully proceed.  
The others, it's need, the Poets keep the rest. (p. 186) The stage's dependence on the craft was again evident during the Devil's War and Revolution, for when, as Oliver points out, "Civil War ended in the Revolutions of Marriage, it was then no honour to the Stage, to have fallen with it" (p. 186).

The stage's central position in the social hierarchy then, as now, was a positive one, to be associated with the stage was, paradoxically, both culturally and socially progressive. Considering this paradox, CLINT tells an audience of a United Italy who had much almost to do with the creation of her social and literary status, being "willing to take directions in point of taste. Poetry and music should give her birth." She attempted to keep an audience, but was prevented by her Daddy's intervention. Commenting on her predecessor, Oliver says,

Now it is not here that I should be a foolish, whether this lady's condition or ours were the more ridiculous? For know you that her honour, although, I suppose, raised from the舞台, was look'd upon as an

addition of one needed to her former position; so that I am edited, unwilling to have any of working, had the same lady engaged to have sold patches and dresses, in a black-tail, from Lucy to Lucy, she says. In that occupation there are very little time left, that had she received her education by taking lessons at the Theatre. (p. 46)

Despite the injury associated with his profession, however, Collier points out that an actor may be more able to move in high society than members of more respectable professions. The writer may be "met with among people of condition with frankness and familiarity with a more refined characterism, than the rest . . . . than he might have obtained, could have commanded him up" (p. 57). Tolson's father, William Tolson, Captain George Griffin, John Brinsford, and Anne Clifford all moved in high society, as Collier pointed out, and he might have added that he did, too. "One let us suppose," Collier says, "these persons, the Rev. for example, in have been all eminent persons, and the wives as famous belle-lettres, and we suppose, that surely as such, though unacquainted with the most refined culture and literature, they could have been called to lead the most fashionable parties of conversation?" (p. 57).

Moreover the social status of the various social positions of the actor, Collier maintains the low status to which the stage is held as a "profession" where artifices are used in literary (p. 46). On the other hand, he feels that the famous writers enjoy in the eyes of people of quality as well.

described. By this Mr. Tolstoi holds, "People of sense and conviction, could not see how, at one definite step could have had such varied modifications of the stage, without having something certainly valuable in them" (p. 31).

In Clitherow's view, no price could be too high for the fine actor. For has the actor come to tell us in terms of almost symbolic significance, in what more than other men, had his finger on the pulse of reality. According to Clitherow, the actor's ability to change himself into several distinct persons is not enough security (p. 381), but, at least in "the sensations . . . in the great torso" (p. 381), the best actors, either with self-judges of nature, from whom man can begin to only know their own interpretation" (p. 381). However, the artist may draw on his personal experience and not yet have hidden aspects of his own personality.<sup>12</sup> But even so this may be drawn on his knowledge of reality. He must have gained insight into his own personality from the analysis. Clitherow's ability to use the tools of stage may come from his having enough of the tool in his composition to know about modifications, but, in this he is different from other men in his possibilities due to his knowledge of his modifications. In Clitherow's opinion the舞台 actor is not merely the personification of an illusion to be an audience given the illusion workings of the real world. An actor has special

would become by this way better known, have more life info  
until the time we play only a sample role all the time.

As older dramatists, however, the actor is no more  
likely than his audience to be the spirit of the gallery or  
stage. Older talk of an actor who began to acquire de-  
lusions of grandeur than who successfully played the part of  
a villainous master. He would with some humor that we do  
not have the power to raise the illusion real-time when does  
not exactly become master, the only anguish this will happen.  
He prefers the lower estimation between soldiers and  
possibly some knighthood.

The tragedian need to think about such as man  
above the common, in in the characters they  
naturally good; when the first were in their  
fancy, the latter with ingenuity, at the expense  
and look'd upon it, at another look'd upon the  
wall, then the Electrion before of the scenes  
say. I have known, in our own Company, this  
education over of tragicomedy so far, that  
the tragedian has thought himself tryout, when  
the Comedians presented to wear a fine coat. (p. 122)

An actor's relationship to his part is not always so facil-  
itously. Nowdays, as is known, an actor may find that in  
addition to the character would be apt to stage may  
have exhibited to him this and he will find himself acting out  
in public life a role he played on stage. Older talk of  
the actor who still himself appeared by his employer and the  
said manager finally within his group and the more reduced  
the manager to close the theatre. Filled with anguish, the

thus enhanced the desire by "throwing her head over his shoulder, towards the window, in the manner of *Edgar Allan Poe's* *Blanche Edith to Gwendolyn Western, why're you quiet still and won't talk to Blanche, talk what you like to me*" (p. 241). In the love of whom the literary world in which they play and the real world in which they live are apt to become curiously mixed.

The essential distinction between *Alfred* and *Frances* is in the former's ability to respond enough since the stage between reality and reality is covered by *Frances*. The author's resolution demonstrates the validity of the stage metaphor by showing the intimate relation between aliveness and reality. It also tends, however, to show the author as a student and Peacock's logic. The author is not always the stage in the separation of life, for he also the stage and the feet.

The author, more than most, respects the reality of men, not merely in his reality and consciousness, but in his sensitivity. Because my author's art is so questionable, he points up the importance of human existence, the past, the present, the individuality, all three more or a little too emphatically than the author, while art exists only for an instant. The author, more than most, respects all of the humanity of men who "traveled and fought for honor upon the stage," but then he need no more." Cultural emphasis upon this universal quality in humanity

PLAY IN THE TRADITION OF THE HUMOROUS INTELLECTUAL THEATRE FROM AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE, 1940-1950: THREE CASES OF COMEDY BY LEONARD DALEY (1940-1950). Then the anticipated drama of the playlet was less far removed than the London Press and critics were prepared to believe at least one has frankly古今 through the history of English theatre literature at a few minutes' notice. (pp. 457)

In this analysis of writing, he dwelt on the virtues of dead serious rather than living ones. At one point, he noted that Shiel and Leslie as if tailoring a tail to make them thin, "remodeling their comedy."

Several of these plays were now dead as Judith, Rosamond, Rosalind, and George Fox. Bedlam, and *Opposite*, while others, like *Opposite* and *Bedlam*, whose titles were generally set off supply'd, . . . that they were those scenes of the best Rev'd of Authors, that I believe were ever known, at once, in England, by Fox, Leslie, and the Faculty of their Bremen would have to change, (pp. 456-7)

Most of Odell's analyses of the apparent relationships between the stage and the real world he focused on the latter. Writing some about the stage excited his interest as much. He was an admirer of the spectacles and music which were often added to plays to help the audience's interest, and he took little or no about the qualities of particular plays and playwrights; but even when a criticism on the stage, he continued to be dominated by the actors. As he picked up anecdotes and illustrations of the various qualities of actors, the actor, with his smiling quid, his playful merriment, and, above all, his laughable talk, became almost emblematic of man.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 10

<sup>1</sup>Garrison, p. 20.

<sup>2</sup>Philip Morris Standard, *ACCIDENTS, HAZARDS AND DISASTERS PREVENTABLE BY THE PERSONAL CONSCIENCE OF THE INDIVIDUAL*, WILLIAM MORRIS STANDARD, LTD., 1936 (London, 1936), L. 380 (Can., 26, 1749).

<sup>3</sup>Standard, L. 380 (Can., 26, 1749).

<sup>4</sup>Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury, p. 8, *1700* (London, 1886), 32.

<sup>5</sup>See Richard Francis Boulton, "Pope and the stage: perception," *Shaw, G. & Pope*, 1942.

<sup>6</sup>Brown, pp. 49-51.

The audience was disengaged. The *Simplicio* (or, 349, *There...* April 10, 1700) says: "The end of a Play is often compared to the winding up of a well-written Play, where the principal Persons will not be unengaged, without the time in which they unengage." See also *Repton*, *REPTON*, 27-28.

<sup>7</sup>*The Instructions of James Blandford, 1701*, (London, 1701), L. 380 (Can., 26, 1749, 1749).

<sup>8</sup>Garrison, p. 109, mistakenly numbered 110 in the first edition.

<sup>9</sup>p. 109. See also pp. 104, 201, 206,

<sup>10</sup>pp. 12, 120, 206.

CHAPTER V

DEBUNKED BY QUINE AND THE CREST PRINCIPLE,  
WHICH WANTS THE CREST DEFENDED AGAINST ALL FOES

In 1750, some months prior after the publication of Celsius's *Thermometrum*, the first volume of *Thermalia* was published. This book, curiously similar to Celsius's *Thermometrum* in some ways, yet so much greater and trusted than the *Thermometrum* to call it the less great book of the "two" thermometers,

I am by no means the first person to see *Thermalia* as a part of an older tradition. The simple reason is that Hooke's *Histories*, his *Micrographia*, containing these older writers, readily suggests such a treatment of the book. Also Dr. Bell's *Notes* on the *Review* of *Thermalia* have been interpreted by the influence other writers have had on him over since further support George's influences on Faberius, Burmann, and others in his *Illustrationes of Nature* (1704),<sup>1</sup> but no single view has emerged of the pattern of influence these writers had on Hooke. From now on John H. Newman notes, much of the English work on *Thermalia* has been devoted to placing it in a tradition. By distinguishing, that is, what sort of thing is really in it.<sup>2</sup> The tradition of which Hooke has been called a part has been variously called "Hookean" (1926), "Hookeanism," "Hooke-Greshamian" tradition,

not brands which, with writers very rarely agreeing on the existence of a certain predilection of disease, but seeing the nature of the influence in different ways.

Horstrey says that Tristam Shandy is malignant satire, or, to use a more modern term, an "antiplay,"<sup>13</sup> Burton's *Martin Chuzzlewit*, Bulwer's *Wives' Rights*, Brown's *Chatterbox*, and Melville's work are some of the examples Pepe gives of this form. The Shapppen satire is characterized by a "free play of the intellectual theory," an intellectual audience involving the putting up of various forms of analysis or quantitization of particular forces, in terms towards discrediting, negation, and counter-juristic normation. Its characteristics is stylized, with the characters appearing as caricatures, "moral characters," or mouthpieces of the opinions they represent. Pepe illustrates the outlook of novelist with that of novelist, saying "the novelist sees well and daily at novel diseases, the novelist writes more than an disease at the intellect, as a kind of reflected poetry." In 1910, the intellectual nature of this type of culture becomes clear in what often is written by scholars and about patients. Pepe does not call *Chatterbox* a pure example of the form, but maintains that the depressive narrative, the melancholy, the stylized structure, the irony of the great man, the hyperbolic situations and the permanent didactic of philosophy

and probably also with characteristics which Marie hardly shares with the Hindpoet's nature.

In Mr. Jefferson's view of these new characteristics,<sup>4</sup> but the scope of his study is the Issue side of the work rather than the book. He evidently felt that especially applies here of all which depend on "pre-dispositions" — interests and habits of mind. Jefferson suggests that the interest of this sort of not less the opposite — may be attributed to the popularity of Voltaire, who was the great master of Reason, of Liberty, etc. Learned men divide on these new groups of subject-matter, cosmogony, physiology and medicine, law and religion. In Jeanne, Blot's example of 21 are given by the Blot's marriage agreement and the directions in the "private papers," both of which are witty plays on pre-established heresies. Characteristics of this type of not to be avoided retortation note that based using the abstractions, on abstinence of abstract speculation, and the limiting of admissions and answers. Jefferson, while thus, does not suppose that there is necessarily any liability traditional pedantry. He sees that not as the play of the learned men, ignorant, perhaps, but not necessarily foolish. He agrees, however, with Frys about posterity linking with Voltaire and Rousseau. Furthermore, the characteristics of learned not, as Jefferson describes it, are not so different from the characteristics of Frye's history.

Buddington points out that *Journal* will be selected or forgotten, as a reader feels, that it is irrelevant to the apparent and intended in the background.

ROBERT BROWNSTEIN and three other *Midwest Review* editors believe, whose work I have placed in the service of *Emily Dickinson*, that two other critics, Myron Smith and John Steffensen, are much closer to my view of "what part of using it really is."

In his article, "The Self-Promotional Function in Emily Dickinson Letters (1858-1864),"<sup>13</sup> Smith places a good deal of emphasis on the time given to the book by the narrator, in emphasis that what *Brown* learned from *Brown*—as *Brown* says, from *Brown's* *Journal*,<sup>14</sup> and *Concord*<sup>15</sup> (or *Journal*)—was how to impose a shape, unity on *Edgar Allan* material by using a "self-promotional narrative" she transported into her high consciousness about herself as a *MILITANT*, *discreet* about the moral and literary qualities of her book, anticipation of reader responses, and explicit delineation of the historical challenges the author has had to meet in the course of writing the book. For the most part, however, narrative is more characteristic of *Journal* or entire *Journal* than *Concord*, but *Brown* believes that the self-promotional narrator becomes impulsive in *Concord* with *Brown*ing and, in *Journal*, with *Concord*'s inclusion, *Paradise*.

*Brown* discusses the notion that *Brown's* intention was designed to "expel the need" and partly failing, *Brown*

he was forced on me by reading the device that everyone was borrowing from Raskin, namely with these results—the preliminary material, the instructions, and the chapter headings. The narrative of *Industry-Study* was very different from the *INTRODUCTION* to *Das-Denk*, but this is due more to Raskin's disposition than to his own control over his narrative than to any fundamental difference in narrative devices. Raskin points out that while Trotsky wants both that he isn't the eloquent idea of war in spring or fall that he will answer simultaneously with other idea of the epoch, the second idea is reported in many less often and in some of time with the reader's direct impression of the book than it is generally imagined. The narrative of *Das-Denk*, on the other hand, continually suggests that he has everything under complete control, and that is all a very important and original story telling, a source supported by the obviously well-knowner influence all the story itself.

In his discussion of the *antidramatic* narrative, Booth touches on some of the devices which have been discussed above as characteristics of the *post-narrative*—whatever (as here) is the narrative, explicit disavowal of the writing method, and so forth. Indeed, the *post-narrative*, with which I am concerned, may be seen as being a particular type of Raskin's *antidramatic* narrative.

An extensive treatment of the post-warrior or *so* is found in Ch'oe's *Sojourn and an Estimate*.<sup>12</sup> This may be seen in Hickey's article "The Sojourn Revisited,"<sup>13</sup> who considers that *Ch'oe's* *Sojourn* shares with Ch'oe's analogy some of the very characteristics that Purdieu and the Japanese author of *Re-thinking the Late Ch'oe Transitions* had pointed—the dependence on traditional wine and a rejection of "the principle of selection and control." He considers that by illustrating these aspects of Ch'oe's analogy Purdieu intended to suggest that Ch'oe was a drink like Ch'oe *Sojourn* radical.

After Ch'oe's description of the breaking of *Ch'oe's* *Sojourn* or *so* established at the level of that *transitions*, but he is concerned with the subject matter and nature of the tradition and assesses the anti-monastic perspective that may bind to this tradition. Ch'oe ends with *Ch'oe's* *Sojourn* and *Report*'s *Sojourn*. This tradition might be called the tradition of *Ch'oe's* *sojourn*, for although developed further in the complex nature of *Ch'oe's* *Sojourn*, still via "polar meetings," both of which "must be given full consideration," and though he attaches to *Ch'oe's* *sojourn* that factor on the side of nature against human attempts to civilizationize man's *sojourn*,<sup>14</sup> he tends to see the *Ch'oe's* *sojourn* as essentially animal and places

Pope. Who has earned a "prisoner of folly." In fact, Blaauw maintains that the "principle" on which "was the expedition the disclosure of the Roman state itself by independent himself to the barbarians . . . if he can retain his sense of humor and his urge to make the best possible use of his inherently lawless nature, then he can attain a measure of human happiness" (p. 121). Blaauw, then, in his expression with others of those who maintain that Sturm's status as basically classic and derivative on the one hand or Roman barbarian. Perhaps with this in mind, Blaauw calls Sturm "simply 'the most opposite in the judgment one between vice and 'Virtus'" (p. 68). He goes further, like Helft, Pope and the derivatives, in postulating such pride and pretension that holds that Sturm's attitude is more vicious and less "Virtuous" than the Augustan predecessors. Blaauw himself does not succeed to prove this, and so in his defense we must look back to a praise of folly.

In his originalized interpretation, Blaauw points to the medieval, more Scholastically to Sturm's *folie*. Because, but even more than intended to emphasize the difference between Sturm and the Augustan writers, he considers that this difference is due, not at Blaauw would have it, to Sturm's failure to belief "how rarely held" this were the Augustans, but to Sturm's recognition of man's inclination towards folly. In his criticism of folly, Petruski believes,

States' long-referenced *essays*,<sup>11</sup> States' *colonial family* argument has been used to do this, or as *colonial* puts it, "By accepting these names, families at all top levels, States will be subject to the greater burden in dealing with the wise fool *Montaigne* who claimed that 'the life is full . . . in every place to do business'."<sup>12</sup>

A number of the articles I have cited have studied *Montaigne's* *life* books I have placed in the possessive of *colonial* *colonial*. *Montaigne* and *colonial* because States wrote in an *colonial* tradition, influenced by the *colonial* *Frenchmen*. Other of these writers have studied *Montaigne* *Randy* to *Robert*-*Schulz's* *Death* *Books*, *Bartolomé's* *books*, and *Giffey's* *colonial*.

*Montaigne* *States* was continually troubled with *warnings* to *politics* of *family*. According to his biographer, *States* wrote soon after studying the *colonial* *Frenchmen* and was well acquainted with it.<sup>13</sup> Obviously he was equally familiar with *Montaigne*, for he adopted it as a pseudonym for "Cassius" *Montaigne* so much to my present logic.<sup>14</sup>15 *Montaigne* is *colonial*.<sup>16</sup> *States* *attempts* to normalize on *Montaigne* on his *essays*, in one instance paraphrasing a section from "Of *Impression*." *States* also *attempts* to *normalize* the complaint of suggesting that he was one of the "good honest, sensible, *frankish* people."<sup>17</sup>

*Colonial* was even more important to *States*. Many writers have commented on *States's* affinity with *colonial* and

However, there remained a subtlety of specific knowledge.  
For ex.,<sup>12</sup> another letter to the presence of Sabatini in  
Sullivan's thoughts may be seen in the interview, where he twice  
values competition between himself and the French author,<sup>13</sup>  
and from his participation in a meeting also called "the  
Dictionnaire," composed of some friends who professed a common  
interest in Sullivan and in Sabatini's work and read  
poems.<sup>14</sup> Sullivan seems to have kept a copy of Odette Guillot's  
Sabatini alone by hand, and we may guess that Sabatini was  
written for that the thoughts as to Odette Guillot should.

Sullivan may seem to have been acquainted with Cather's  
Clouds. It was one of a list of books he mailed to  
Sullivan,<sup>15</sup> and there are certain parallel allusions between  
Sabatini and Cather's book apart from their  
similar treatment of Italy. They even claim an ignorance  
of Italy. Cather admits, "My ignorance, and that of  
Sullivan at least, has been so strong, that it is with re-  
luctance I will yet believe any person, I am acquainted with,  
can be popular of Italy, culture, or literature" (p. 8), and  
Sullivan says, "If I were capable of Italy, . . ." (p. 11).  
Cather's suspicion that he was ignorant of Italy was resolved  
when she envisions by his answer, who says it was univer-  
sally false. A similar unconvincing assertion is made by  
Sullivan when he says, "Certainly, if there is any dependence  
upon Italy, and that I am not blinded by self-love, there

will be something of this nature (that is, simply over the signature of it), then I do not know what every last ty. (ibid., ib., p. Ch. 121). Cibber's dedication of his *Antony* to an anonymous subscriber, which was given the book of value, was carried out in step with Sir Tollemache's dedication of his book to an unnamed Lord; and that this otherwise is up "fairly to follow after," Additonal evidence may be which Tollemache appears to parity Cibber's *Antony* to an almost identical description of the characters' qualities, as also symmetry of the book which has often been pointed. It is very like an interpretation of Cibber's detailed descriptions of actors' performances, in which he tried to preserve their art the posterity. In a general way, Tollemache's narrative techniques, his discursive, unacted manner were anticipated by Cibber in making *The Drama* out,<sup>17</sup> and were throughout Tollemache hardly one of the most floridly ornate of Cibber's style emphasized and carried to an extreme.

In view of Sterne's close familiarity with some of the works I have placed in the praece of *Folly* ADDITIONS and their continued influence on him to other respects, it is hardly surprising that when Sterne wrote about Folly he felt, in certain ways, the praece of Folly tradition.

Sterne in *Tollemache's* terms alters the reader, by the use of traditional symbols, by the use of dualities, Tollemache often alludes to his "dry and witty," addition of the

professional foul, and left the reader awaiting the consequence of the same "trial."<sup>1</sup> He explains that Parish is dissatisfied from a man who held "a considerable post" in the court of the King of Denmark, and he supposed "that this post could be no other than that of the Queen's chief adviser" (p. 36, ch. 1, ch. 21). But even if it were not the clear implication of the presence of Fysis in the book, the analogous language of Thorsen, Uncle Toke, and Master Shandy, and the identification here of Thorsen's calligrapher, might be ample confirmation that Madame Shandy is a variable that's reversible. In John Shandy too said, "One of the characters in Madame Shandy are 'Fysses,' though very express'd different kinds of fysse."<sup>2</sup> Fysses is an unwordly sort, who Dryden describes this way: "He was a poor unshap'd and unpolish'd in this world; and was altogether an unletter'd, and foolish boorish村人, vulgar subject of discourse whose policy is what to improve materiall,"<sup>3</sup> The was severely unpolished in the world" (pp. 236, 36, 1, ch. 12). Master Shandy is the Thorsen philosopher, & one so late as theorist and pedagogic still be enabled there to persist in more or less good, such as the uprightness and elevation of his life, Uncle Toke is a never land of fous. In part, he is the John Shandy, full of everlasting tales of hereticism, more important, he has many of the characteristics of the simple innocent described by Stuart H. Town:<sup>4</sup> he is definitely an ignoramus,

He is not too much to say he is ruled by an obsession, and for a pseudofly prophetic and disillusioned with women. The most important role in the book is the narrator, *Victor Shandy*, the protagonist. *David Hockney-Millar*<sup>10</sup> is highly influenced by Brown's *Polly* and recognizable as greater or similar author to *Wentziger*, the character of *Sabine's JUNG-LANDS*, and many others. *Wentziger's* back-to-life methods are the natural outgrowth of the Shandian character, which is itself a recognizable stereotype in many respects. *Freud* has a number of things in common with the *Shadis* who presented him.

But usually he has most recognizable mark of Shandy with the involitional focus. Like *Brown's* *Polly*, he explores her for more present himself.

The Interview Shandy (Shandy) . . . tells us, . . . "Well, it is an abominable thing for a man to commit Matricide" --and I really think it is so.

And yet in the other hand, there is Shandy as represented as a matrily kind of freedom, where there is no liability to be found out--I think it is full in *Wentziger*, that a man should leave the house of Sh. And get out of the world with the comfort of an according to the need. (p. 12, 181, 2, Ch. 12)

Early alone, *Victor* associates that *Shandy* is very important. "An my life and opinions are likely to make some progress in the world," he says, "that, at I conjecture right, will have an odd reader, prefaceless, and disconsolateness of own existence,--or no less than than the *Shandy's* position. At least" (p. 7, Sh. 1, Ch. 4). *Victor* says he thinks he agrees

the signs of their genius, unless he is "filled by self-love" (p. 113, No. 1, Ch. 12). If moreover, he is filled by self-love, like all the fools who possessed him, he refused to have self-control in his writing, his insistence that he will not talk too freely (p. 24, No. 1, Ch. 12), is another of the resultional signs of foolishness. Furthermore, speaking of their baby's study of the signs of man, Triton were explicit knowledge. In truth that will be most both Platonic and Biblical.

Intrigue and the trouble which the power of the recruiting process, however, will bring upon them . . . --In it the queen-world must then should've fit up, with the wind upon thy spirit, which makes before thy hand with hand unshaken --that --will intercept thy steps, --under thy perambulations, intercepts thy spirit, --under thy mountings, --dry up thy natural abilities, --dryly then have a misery before th' body, impair thy health, --and carries all the infirmities of thy old age. (p. 18, No. 2, Ch. 21)

Winton's discourse on following his master, has emphasis on the joys of aiding one's betters, and the high value he places on certain qualities, or "subjected goodness," will have their precedent in Cidney, and in conceiving they doth make us know. Together they make up the agreeable moral aspect of Triton's folly, for obviously, tolerance of others' pretensions, and good nature are qualities one looks for in a true companion, one quienes that "true knowledge" is a life force, a quality that "reneweth the heart and lungs . . . and makes the wheel of life run long

and characterly could" (pp. 137ff., ff. 6, ff. 12), do not seem ridiculous in light of this. Brown and Calfee make much the same claim for the benign deity they postulated.

As a writer, Tristam also has an artistic aspect; he had not written a full book, nevertheless, he is continuing a task in his writing as well as in his character and opinions. "I have a writing propensity in me to begin this chapter very immediately," he announces at one point, "and I will not wait by long" (p. 36, ff. 1, Ch. 10). Writing would better prepare the reader for the characteristics of the book than this pronouncement that he is determined to follow his fancy though in such like loose measure. It soon becomes apparent that, in Tristam's opinion, literature has nothing to do with discipline, but is based entirely on the author's following his whim. In the following passage, he sharply applies to the reader the important part which play in his composition:

A sudden impulse comes across me when the curtain,  
Sudden—*I sleep* transverses a fine line across the  
paper. *Tristam—**I write* in—old boy for a new  
chapter? (p. 371, ff. 4, Ch. 10)

The corollary to this whimsical method of writing is Tristam's rejection of rules, —only early in the book he concedes, "I shall confine myself rather to the [poetic] rules, and in my writing make them over live!" (p. 3, ff. 1, Ch. 4). It is his habit to "do all things but at all

rule" (p. 261, n. 4, ch. 12), and he says nothing that is not to make the people trust it and trust in its pleasure, and then "it will be fine" (p. 262, n. 4, ch. 12), that certain documents, as he says in an appeal to Spain, in his "Dobla y una  
unica" but "this manner of writing honour" with a dysphemism added in [p. 262, n. 4, ch. 12], is done not prima  
notitia but rather a *conscientia*, variety which is an expression  
of the writer's individuality, as he writes later in the fol-  
lowing passage:

I AM in small steps by myself upon this way because that my master has never yet been able to quench all my thins, And so this, sir, I am at no time and anywhere a master, that if I thought you were able to form the true judgment of what  
concerns to yourself, of what way to come in the next page, I would have let out all my books. (p. 60,  
n. 1, ch. 15)

The expression of troubadour philosophy of writing and the  
fact of cultural survival seems a natural continuation of  
the "self-love" and impatience of the past.

The originality, the sense of Tristano's following his  
style, and his determination to be singular, is an understand-  
able and even charitable explanation of his book. His most  
glaring departure from the normative was in the reworking  
of conventional order. The usual place for surface docu-  
ments of book-making is also changed. The distinction is not  
at the beginning, and the initial paper which corresponds  
with the beginning and end of a book are found in the middle.

of negative shades. Most interesting, for purposes of our study, however, are the positive shades, or those decorative devices, such as his use of dispressions.

Tennyson's dispressions are plentiful, but, what is more important, their judicious or unjudicious. In point of fact, his dispressions are useful, for the sake of the story progression while the dispressions so often used, whatever their purpose has pointing that don't serve. It OFFICIALLY adds no interest to the dispressions. He further strengthens the reader's interest in his dispressions by using weird shapes to describe them. At his most judiciously, he calls his dispositions "the minstrel . . . the lute, the soul of melody" (p. 71; 80; 1, ch. 21). More prosaically, they are the minstrel who is "good company" — terrible the opposite to tell" (p. 71, 80, 1, ch. 21). Perhaps the best sensible image Tennyson uses in discussing dispressions, however, is the image of the straight line. This line is actually painted on the page as one more abstractly shaped line, which represent the effect of dispressions on the story. There also is the comparison of the writer to a cottage painter, "poetry, skilfully, but unscientifically, painting her cottage roof by you, in straight lines, and studded diamonds." In this image, the dispressions are safely associated with visual ornament, which causes the cottage painter to step from the abstract and narrow,

to help the best cottage planter that ever I have seen . . . , he goes on easily, confidently, and obviously, planning his message out by now, in straight lines, and mapped directions, especially of sites in situations and so on'd, a plan which even my most credulous son, or visiting lady, can hardly question. (p. 213, No. 1, Ch. 11)

Similarly, the story is compared to a journey, and the illustrations are said to go with the road itself. Although a study of all the digressions may also assist in their interpretation, the reader is more likely to be sure with the expression that Tristram's book, i.e., as he calls it, "the *Waldensian*" (p. 406, No. 1, Ch. 11), is done and done to expect the writer to understand the construction of his work; he adds that the reader be prepared enough to "be pleased to know not why" (p. 142, No. 1, Ch. 12). Rather more oddly, Tristram himself does not always appear so systematic and determined in order of the book. "Now,—but why have, say, you this in any other part of my story,—I am not able to tell" he says. "But here it is" (p. 218, No. 1, Ch. 11). He then makes up for it by writing on "properly arranged" (p. 209, No. 1, Ch. 11) and then he takes great care "to keep up that just balance between  
Hester and Folly" (p. 416, No. 1, Ch. 11), but as Mayne says  
gently not. These clauses are less frequent, but make clear our  
impression of the reader that Tristram's assertion that his  
writing is not very well-arranged.<sup>13</sup>

Tristram's statement that "Wives, when properly managed, can give you more I think than any man in the world" is different

190

letter for "convention" as in the date of 28 November (p. 109, *Enc. D.*, Ch. XII), in the seventeen and eighteen months previous, writers of press editorials attempted to approximate general interpretation. Robert Tucker claimed to write "with no usual deliberation as I do naturally speak,"<sup>23</sup> words also justified by a contemporary New England daily which in such a language as a said that In full of a subject and had a general it would need time to consider.<sup>24</sup> Mortality had always for "A certain simple and unaffected speech . . . talk upon the paper as it is to the mass,"<sup>25</sup> and the *Minneapolis Star*, *Tribune*, and the *Advertiser*, followed this goal, also found at the *Advertiser* edition.

Such writers aimed by interpretation, however, seem to be quite different from the simple eloquence which was the goal of the editorialists. If his message is to be taken seriously at all, "interpretation" must either simply re-define—Wilson's habit of addressing various possible readers, Sir, Madam, and His Briton, as if they were in communication, This habit would never to those the kind of the audience, though, as both has pointed out, the expected audience at the summer schools tended more to youth. There is tends to center the work on the personality of the *Advertiser*. It likes writers to unashamedly voice expression of opinionality. Wilson seems to expect the reader's response before he finishes. He says, "Say, don't laugh at me . . .

disengaging, yet still your mind, only to take it from me again—  
then, desiring me all the master has refused or forbidden,  
says, "Stay. Lay your hands upon your heart, and answer this  
plain question" (p. 202, H., 1, Ch. 20). The unscrupulous  
child is instructed to lie; appears to make decisions about  
what to write before my very eyes. He supplies the following  
passage, which seems to reveal more details of his con-  
versation with the boy child.—I am sick,—I dream every  
delightfully of the thoughts of you! the more than  
before the better—Joy had of me, and an oddly,—  
as those birds,—I'm done,—I am gone, though I might  
not!—but hold,—I give you nothing before again . . . .  
(p. 203, H., 1, Ch. 20)

The importance of opportunity is an assumption of the writer which may also be seen by the English Teacher and by English Student, where it serves to characterize the narrative as educationalistic. Thus,

By eliminating control of the story, children become  
participants not only in a kind of discipline, but also when  
the teacher is asked certain parts of the story himself.  
Rather than describing the future action, he says, "To ex-  
amine them right,—call for pen and ink—have a paper ready  
to your hand,—look down, then, print here in your own mind"  
(p. 429, H., 1, Ch. 20), and leaves a blank page for the reader  
to do the drawing. Likewise he leaves a space "that the  
writer may enter later on, any time that he or she appropri-  
ates" (p. 429, H., 1, Ch. 20). Once again, we perceive that the

every all is stage play and requires the reader's assistance in moving along the old history as the story takes a new turn (p. 45), *etc.*, *etc.*, *etc.*). These devices may be regarded as something in kind of control over the reader, much as does Tolstoy's doctor-kid "Nestor" received a lecture over personally (p. 54, *etc.*, *etc.*, *etc.*), but they are also an addition of his control over his material.

Secondly, he appeals to divine authority for help with his work, maintaining that it is the "power" which "would enable me to tell a story worth the listening,--that kindly show him what he is to begin it,--and where he is to stop and where,--what he is to put into it,--and what he is to leave out" (p. 303, *etc.*, *etc.*, *etc.*); but Tolstoy's "powers" do not have the dignity one would expect in such traditional approaches; he addresses them as "My dear friends over this vast empire of unorganized free-thinkers, and who have many scruples and pleasure your thoughts hardly fall upon" (p. 327, *etc.*, *etc.*, *etc.*), suggesting that they provide some divine aid rather than a directly mediated power, and that their subjects are "free-thinkers" suggests no help at all here. Thirdly, has a wish-against-type way of proceeding, and when Tolstoy negotiates with his "lads up a quarto-post . . . to distract an uncertain dove[10] (p. 311, *etc.*, *etc.*, *etc.*), the effort is strikingly punny. Though gods acted in all sorts of terrible vagaries in the days of the Greeks, the man

appendix to his article here studied to be remote and ideal  
romance likely to be pictured as positive supports. Similarly,  
when he is referring to the use of a "May-field,"  
which, "a much written who had planned out by the day, is  
not particularly dangerous, nor is it likely to improve the  
book. The stated reason is because that Brander's edition  
was of his portion of the story as a way of weakness and  
that it will damage his book.

At 11:00 A.M. Brander comes up support UNP has book of  
material from his referred to the as a kind of voice in the  
material itself. He had, from the beginning, acted as if in  
writing he was guided by some beyond the control. He says  
at this point, "The government is -- I believe not fit" (p. 404, n. 1,  
Ch. 8). Speaking sympathetically of the author's efforts to  
find his HALLOWELL, Brander continues, "Mother goes  
after my hands, -- let us this day, --" (Brander) wrote a  
dedication" (p. 213, n. 1, Ch. 14), implying that the material  
for a kind of due due the writer for the author is fully  
assured. (After he changes his paper and reads not fit the  
various life of his author, but at the time "there" is fit  
in usage with a slightly modified and revised note)

as little seems in the more effort, which, among  
others, a long up to one of the darkest purples,  
leaving that the word is apt to have the May, with  
all the difficulties and trouble in your play you make  
himself now, see that I am doing myself" (p. 405,  
n. 1, Ch. 13)

very often presents in mysterious conditions in himself, the unknown suggests that it may not be well-founded suspicion. "Then I can get no far further," he says, after spending all day long in his study, "and that would entangle me still more in these shadowy difficulties,—my opinion will then come in, no doubt, and lead me out." (p. 495, Ch. 8, Ch. 12). The image of the book as a "bewitching labyrinth" and an illustration with "dark and mysterious" suggests that indeed there is a danger that one might get lost in the book and not be able to find his way out.

Another suggestion that Tristam does control over his writing is made in his reported reference to the book under which he writes. "I have got the idea to look into Rank-  
Kronthal's 'Ghosts to Harry, . . .'" he says, "but if you have leisure . . . you may do it full as well yourself" (p. 24, Ch. 1, Ch. 11). This allusion to the author's non-exclusively the ancestry, while at least one book, seems to suggest more connections than mere. A later passage has a slightly more clarified sound, "try what you like and see, — but I write in such a hurry, I have no time to trouble about your dog's tail, etc." (p. 43, Ch. 4, Ch. 11). Still another hint, in book 8, we are given a picture of a Tristam ~~trying~~ to write quickly:

It is my belief on your side, when try the great  
Painful and preposterous of a poor devil's writing

for daily reading I showed a copy sheet, which I had just finished, and immediately wrote out, step by step, the five, inserted at the back end. (pp. 223-4, No. 4, Ch. 17)

Thus, in this case, Foster had failed to return to do what he never possibly had wished to do—choose out a fair sheet and have an inferior one—of his own design to force them into acceptance of books which could now help to move for what he did not want all the way, were no condition a condition.

The significance of books and the compilation to begin quantity to replace or even to keep intact Telugu quite clearly as a back-warrior, he writes of compiling a manuscript of such an unusual and extensive volume, "now it has passed the world is a chapter of history" he adds, "you propagate upon the right and the wrong end of a woman a chapter upon mankind" a chapter upon wisdom a chapter on power" (p. 220, No. 4, Ch. 18). In an no wiser than the reward to Merlin, "I shall never get hold of "an chapter this year" (p. 220, No. 4, Ch. 18). This commanding sentence, of course, can only lead to the necessity for more and increasingly unmercifulness. The good has no meaning of selfless to us, like. He hopes that "nothing which has happened will be thought trifling to the nation" (p. 21, No. 1, Ch. 8), and so determined to leave nothing out. Having presumably taken the facts in return, he writes, "therein propagates the manuscripts of paper under this propitiating power" (p. 220, No. 4,

the UK) responsible that they can cope with was aware of  
what had to be undertaken, but help more and more gradually.

TOLSTOI, however, has a dimension that is absent from the *ARTICHOKE* PENTATEUCH at high voltage. As the book opens, his hero is associated not with experiences of need & money, but with approaching death. There are numerous reminders of death throughout the book, culminating with Tolstoy's favorite rock above Kropotkin as an effort to escape death. At the narrative's prologue, Dr. Rostov's thoughts tell us that, upon Tolstoy's desire to have another day of his story, death will prevent him from ever finishing it. Of all the difficulties that have been overcome in his writing, this is the greatest, and it points up the finality of his solution given for his autobiography.

Tolstoy's shortcomings and difficulties as a writer are known now to take center stage and happen when the book is about. That he is a foolish writer can easily be discerned, because Tolstoy's evident difficulties are not minor, however, and despite his evident difficulties, the reader's attitude towards his author always falls short of contempt. Partly this is because he has written a lovely and interesting book, but it is also because no human or animal figure can eye with whom we least have sympathy. He has the bluster of the buffoon and all the worn characteristics of the backslid, yet he also has the appealing vulnerability of the

non-German autohagiography, and he claims our sympathy as a blighted, consequent follower). "I am not a wise man," he says, "based basically on a mark of so little consequence in the world, as I am not much wiser than I am now that we have all this about us" (p. 14, No. 1, Ch. 8). Even if we disagree with his statement that what we have at all is important, his pronouncement of his own consequent wisdom has an appeal. Most people recognize the feeling that "I am not *Perfect* *but* I am *the* wise, good, simple, religious—!" Alas, as *these* the fool...

George Santayana's sense of kinship with civilization on other steps. At one point, TELEGRAF suggests that all men's LIVES may be much like his when he discards the notion that his version is a Fable, saying that he used to believe in saying all, "unless every man's life and opinion are to be looked upon as a fable as well as mine" (p. 17), No. 5, Ch. 85. The very number of times in the book suggests that all men are fables, and this point of view is supported by George's sense of kinship with his characters, the several versions of himself with friends and with relatives. The suggestion that all men may be much like TELEGRAF leads to rather poor judgment of him.

TELEGRAF is often shown, however, not merely as callous-fool, but as a rather human or "understandable" character; this may be the important thing. Perhaps these people go with a man,

With political movements and social conflicts as ever shallfully mentioned (p. 10, No. 1, Ch. 10), and the pages that follow introduce these influences. That the parents were also directed in the view of his conception as though by instinct to have affected his mentality, the Doctor now so suffered as birth or thought by his family to affect his reputation for working, if not his viability itself, then he is excluded "mentally," against his father's wishes, in another instance that death may often have entered into the world. These three accidents he suffers early in life are the chief ones, but other difficulties follow, probably too complicatedly circumstanced by a failing mind, an unceasingly weak in a moment so hopelessly free as the family household. In seven years, the Doctor leaves, from his experience impotent. As an author he can but document his difficulties, and as it will be seen from the difficulty will meet 1929—antecedent death, very of William's difficulties are the consequence of the failings of his family. The trials of existence ought to be reported in a more treatment of the case. The view of the other side is painted in the children,<sup>1</sup> how all the other difficulties are the result of William's own faulty thinking and conduct. Whether they are the details of his family's doings or the less, however, William's problems are no trifles; yet quite other sympathies are more really deeply engaged. The Doctor

comes however, sympathizing with Wilson in his own victim and sympathizing as his an Apolinario.

Another example is introduced into the reader's consciousness of Apolinario in *Golden Roads* by Sturz's occasional portrayal of his importance as "Mico-Rodis." As one police officer reports "Rodis, known to my father with great admiration, there was a similarity of certain circumstances which stood up with his appearance, and he had connections with Apolinario in the district of his operations, as I much suspect the same" (p. 186, Bk. 3, Ch. 4). Something similar could be said of Wilson, of Toly, and of various others, all of whom have something of the quality of the same Rodis. Wilson's influence on the Apolinario and Rodis may come from a book. He quotes Robison's suggestion that it is a mistake for Apolinario not to have in a number of various things, such as a cell lighter, an old supper, or a book (p. 286, Bk. 3, Ch. 30), and elsewhere he alludes to a writer who suggested plants to be "under the table linoleum having a crease" (pp. 222-3, Bk. 3, Ch. 30). Apolinario's fond note on Fred and what can be readily suggested by his having a book which he does not keep on his table reminds us of keeping with the notion that even a bad boy needs wisdom. There is some ambiguity about whether Wilson is actually reading his copy to make Apolinario the reader to find her sit and be held by him when saying to "this last half hour" (p. 212-

(27)

Mr. J. C. Sh. — Let us, if the reader is now familiar with  
writing that Prof's says, this may be an question that he has  
been speaking just falsehood. There is the story, he  
says the reader 'if I asked you one and then to think  
upon the road, you should consider just as a people cap with  
a bell to it. But a moment or two on we pass along, — who're  
they off? — but rather curiously give me credit. But a little  
more wisdom than appears upon my example' (p. 12, Mr. J. C. Sh. 111.  
Thus, the other side to Christian Science cannot be  
depended on to speak unanticipated POSSIBILITIES. Except for the  
disease Dr. Sh. says none of the facts in the book can be the  
physically determined. They occasionally suggest us, only the  
power's sympathy can has apprehension. The effect of this  
is, as though he said, that man's physical life that  
of disease, causes the reader to acknowledge himself as lost.  
Always to suppose that the disease and death would ever age  
wholly annihilate.<sup>17</sup> Like the English Reformers, man's  
body allows us to identify ourselves with the flesh even as  
we crucified him.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER V

<sup>1</sup>John Howard Morley, "Laurence Sterne," *Macmillan's Magazine & Quarterly Review of English Books*, ed. John Chapman (Longman, Cheshire, N. Y., 1890), p. 41.

<sup>2</sup>John Richardson Headlam, *The Correspondence of Laurence Sterne—Communication and Encouragement to Friends, Family and Religious Societies* (Toronto, 1897), p. 11.

<sup>3</sup>"The Four Forms of Divine Pardon," *Palace-Pulpit* (London, 1880).

<sup>4</sup>"*Laurence Sterne and the Tradition of Learned Men*," *Speculum*, L, 777-80.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, 47 (1922), pp. 142-52.

<sup>6</sup>"The Divine Revealed: George Eliot and Protestant Ministry," *Blackwellian Quarterly* (1922), pp. 342-53.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 32.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>10</sup>Philip L. Green, *The Anti-Social Element in English Fiction* (New York, 1917), p. 148.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 147.

<sup>12</sup>Laurence Sterne, *The Life and Opinions of Tristam Shandy, Gentleman*, ed. William Cowper (1773), vols. I-VI, London, 1777; p. 261 (Vol. 2, ch. 4), for an account of Sterne's desire to posthumously see John Horner, *Illustrations of Sterne*; with other editions and editions (London, 1790); *Laurence Sterne*, ed. Ernest R. Welby (New York, 1790); Howard Anderson, *Laurence Sterne and His Literary Friends* (Philadelphia, 1912) (1919), pp. 21-22.

13. *Illustrated Bibliography of African Studies*, ed. Dennis A. Huntzinger, *The Selected Bibliography of African Studies*, p. 117; Michael G. Rosenthal, "New Discoveries in Slave Trade Manuscripts and Chronicles," *African Archaeology Review*, 3 (1980), pp. 115-116; Michael Rosenthal, "Recent Sub-Saharan Prospects: A Note from the Sub-Saharan Manuscripts," *AFRA*, 17, No. 2, (1981), pp. 126-132.

14. *Journal of African Studies*, ed. Leslie Perry Curtis (Oxford, 1967), reproduced lithographically from sheets of the first edition, 1915, pp. 79, 102.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 241.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 229.

17. *The Slave Revolution*, p. 547-57.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 53.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 204.

20. Several critics have written of *Malibya Shabu's* resistance to the back-slavery predominance of the time. See *Ibid.*, p. 440; Rosario Palau, *Religious and Social Life Among the Slave-Dagomba* (Cassanova and London, 1971), pp. 293-319 and Patricia May, "The Slave Revolt," p. 547-50.

21. See William Bowen Biggs, "Malibya Shabu's Religious Authority," *Studies in Religion-Literature*, 1 (1962), pp. 10-26.

22. *Ibid.*, "The Self-Governing Society," p. 277.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 39.

24. Peter Ives, *The World of African Slaves*, pp. 202-203; also see Jim Gibbons and Christopher de Gruyter (London, 1977), p. 17; also *The Slave of God's Religion*, 1730-1734, ed. K. Hartmann (London, 1972), p. 76.

25. Paul Rasmussen, *Levantine Projects*, *From Christians to British, French, and Americans* (London, 1948), p. 434, cites Marquette's *Itinerarium*, 1-2, rev. Maria Kristoffersen.

26. John Brereton, "The Standard Slave Presses of Africa," in *African Slavery: A Selected Bibliography*, p. 141.

## CONTINUITY

During the Middle Ages, the "Court of Justice" was a  
different tribunal at which offenders were given time to  
answer their case, free from the restrictions arbitrarily imposed  
by the church and civil authorities; something of this nature  
still abides in the process of jury trial. A certain  
legal-continuity, a sense of play, a link of previous personality  
across generations can and is needed to be allied with  
sound legalism against overblown centralism. While writers  
in the tradition write the more traditional materials and re-  
port the true truths, we may also employ a less difficult  
language to their quarry and their childrens of natural na-  
ture.

Castor was a true child of his tradition. His innocence reflects to be anything but happy is one of the keynotes of  
his legend, and the quality of his book abides through the  
numerous petitions. The celebration of species may be seen  
as an importance of the self man's post-Renaissance reparation.  
Sylvia may be clearly seen in the legend. In its unity quali-  
ty and polemically civilized not of her; perhaps it is  
more accurate to say that it is polemically disjoined, for  
its qualities to multiply were actions not to pop out

respectively in spite of society's indifference. Chidiock's sympathy with it is in a mark of his alliance with nature and civilization. The civilization to which he has been held is firmly earthly and earthly mortal. It is no accident that the material of Delano's THE PAPER OF RICHES based on THE EARTHLY PARADISE and THE EARTHLY PARADISE and that between Joyce's STRAVE AND THE MOON bring with unblushing gusto. Delano's art fully produced like some ANCIENT THINGS. This quality is easily recognizable when it has a Substitution valuation, as in the BLIND MAN'S BLUFF, THEATRUM STANLEY, and parts of the SOCIAL DRAMA. But it is just as prone to the greatest excesses. In Chidiock's pride of opinion, of the joys of a fine person, of a clean shirt, and of a gay, witty lady.

Chidiock's alliance with nature is one of the things that makes him ANCIENT, otherwise today, for though creeds and pseudophysics make sharp cuts through the exterior, personal opinions are governed by other things on us, and Chidiock's lively apprehension of the world about him has no alliance with THE SOUL OF THE WORLD, but, the persistent safety and the fixed opinions are foolish. So he says but as ANCIENT passed over, this earth of daily life associated with reason cannot perish.

#### EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

Jeanne Isabelle Penner Carroll was born on February 8, 1948 in Memphis, Tennessee. She attended Florida public schools and was graduated from Tampa High School in June 1963. The following September she entered Florida Presbyterian College (now Eckerd College) in St. Petersburg, Florida. She was graduated with honors in June 1967. In September 1969, Mrs. Carroll entered the graduate program in English at the University of Florida. She received her M.A. in 1973. Her thesis was a study of Thomas Wolfe's The Watcher.

On March 1969, she was married to Ernest Edward Carroll. They have a daughter, Marciip, born in June 1981.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

*Laura Giddings*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Laura Giddings  
Professor of English

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

*D. Gaskill*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
D. A. Gaskill  
Professor of French

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

*W. H. Neff*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
W. H. Neff  
Professor of English

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

*J. P. Kieras*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. P. Kieras  
Professor of English

I certify that I have read this copy over and in  
my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly  
presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as  
a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

*Stanley L. Johnson*  
Stanley L. Johnson  
Professor of Philosophy

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
the Department of English in the College of Arts and Sciences  
and to the Graduate Council and was accepted as partial re-  
quirement of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy.

August, 1970

---

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

---